THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 110, NO. 4 NEW YORK, MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1944 NUMBER 1521

European Theatre

With the arrival of General Eisenhower in London to take command of the Allied Expeditionary Force, the cast is complete for the opening of the greatest military drama in history. No beginning has ever been better publicized, and yet all the announcements and speculations have merely served as a screen for the three critical secrets—when, where and how.

Apparently the men and materials are ready. At least two conditions must be assured before the blow is actually struck, however. One is air supremacy in western Europe; the second is coördination with campaigns on the Russian and possibly other fronts, to obtain the maximum possible dispersion of German forces. In relation to the first, the approach of the critical date is perhaps signalized by the unusually heavy opposition sent by the Germans against the Americans' daylight mission over aircraft-assembly plants. It is the Germans' purpose to keep as large a reserve of fighters as possible; it is our purpose to force them into the air and put them out of action. Ground demolitions which injure too greatly the Luftwaffe's capacity to service and replace their combat planes force them to greater fighting risks before the invasion begins. On the Russian front, in turn, the winter offensive is making splendid progress, but it would be bad planning either if we struck at a time when the Germans could still conduct an orderly retreat without too heavy losses and by the use of a minimum of reserves, or if we waited until the Red Army had temporarily spent its force and had no more powerful reserves to throw into the attack.

As to where, there is no doubt that the "invasion coast" of France offers the best possibility of landing and supplying large armies, but whether it will be chosen for the initial blow is uncertain; Hitler is obviously preparing for other eventualities. And the how, in spite of methods disclosed in the Mediterranean, may still reveal surprises. The most we can do at home is to work hard and behave ourselves as decently as we can, while we await the curtain.

The CIO in Politics

The Political Action Committee of the CIO, described in an article on page 111 of this issue by Helen Fuller, held its first conference in New York City on January 14-15. Similar meetings will be held later in various parts of the country. At this one, several hundred delegates from CIO unions heard a multitude of addresses from Vice President Wallace, Mayor LaGuardia, Dr. Alvin Hansen and many of their own leaders, from President Philip Murray and Sidney Hillman, chairman of the committee, on down. The general trend of the conference was that peacetime planning is urgently necessary. There was an evident feeling that, whatever they may say to the contrary, such groups as the National Association of Manufacturers want some degree of unemployment as a weapon to use against labor. Several speakers united in demanding policies that would create a national income of $200,000,000,000 a year and permanent employment for 62,500,000 persons.

The conference met under the shadow of legal proceedings against the committee. The CIO has set aside for its use $700,000; and Rep. Howard W.

CONTENTS

The Week 99

Editorials

The President Points the Way 102
Russia in Europe 103
America and France 104

General Articles

Colonies and Freedom . . . Julian Huxley 106
The Future of Austria . . Heinz H. F. Eulau 109
Labor and Politics . . . . Helen Fuller 111
Soldiers' Prose . . Pfc. Prudencio de Pereda 113
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 115
Among the Missing: Hitchcock . Manny Farber 116
The Bandwagon 117

Correspondence 117

Books in Review

Europe in Exile . . . . Malcolm Cowley 120
Education After the War . F. O. Matthiessen 121
Interim Report . . . . Richard Lee Strout 122
What Made Sammy . . . George Mayberry 123
Portrait of a Musician . . . Arthur Berger 124
A Reader's List 126

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1944, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Smith of Virginia, co-author of the Smith-Connally anti-labor law, announced that in his opinion this fund violated that law, which forbids contributions by labor unions to political parties. Attorney General Francis Biddle has promised an immediate investigation. We are confident that this investigation will give the committee a clean bill of health. It intends to use its funds, not as donations to any political party, but for the political education of its members and of the general public. The CIO leaders know that it is greatly to labor's advantage to bring out a maximum vote in national elections. If Mr. Smith's interpretation of his law were the correct one, and labor were forbidden to spend any money whatever in political-educational activities, the United States would indeed be well advanced on the road to fascism.

Mr. Hillman and the ALP

In New York State, the CIO Political Action Committee has run into serious trouble. The American Labor Party in that state consists of two factions: the Communist-led left wing and a right wing which is "right" only by comparison with the Communists; it has, for example, about the same general philosophy and outlook as The New Republic. The Communists are a large minority in the statewide organization of the ALP, and they control it in all boroughs of New York City except the Bronx. Sidney Hillman, chairman of the PAC, proposes that control of the ALP be turned over to the CIO trade unions, though apparently he would not exclude independent liberals from maintaining membership in the party. Since some of the CIO unions are Communist-led, this would mean that the Communists would probably control the ALP in New York City and would influence it strongly in the state as a whole.

To this, the right-wing leaders in the ALP are bitterly opposed. They know by long experience how hard it has been in the past to work with the Communists, who, until just before June 22, 1941, were calling this a meaningless imperialist war, and were fomenting strikes in American war factories. (Now, of course, they are 110-percent American.) The right-wing leaders have insisted that the Communists have no place in a party devoted to democratic principles and that individual Communists were guilty of moral turpitude when they repudiated their own party (which is soon to be dissolved) and registered and voted as ALP members.

Plus and Minus in New York

Mr. Hillman, of course, looks at the question from the national point of view. The CIO certainly can hardly discriminate against the Communist-led unions in its ranks, and his policy of demanding united political action by all CIO unions is one that should work well in the country as a whole. Probably Mr. Hillman and the other CIO leaders assume that Mr. Roosevelt will run again and that they will support him, in spite of recent disputes over the national-service act and other matters. If the President is to be re-elected, he will need all the votes he can possibly get, and especially in such a crucial state as New York. No doubt the CIO members, whether Communists or not, will all vote for him, and so will those in the right wing of the ALP. Yet there is greater effectiveness of political action in a group which is unified than in one torn by internal dissension. On the whole it would probably have been better if Mr. Hillman had let the ALP alone and had rallied his forces under some new name, as he will have to do throughout the country except in New York State. Since he did not do this, we are glad that the ALP right wing will use democratic methods and will dispute control of the party at the primary election next April. If it loses, it can still maintain its organization under another name if it wishes. In any case, a labor party in one state only is not of great importance, in the long run, against Republican and Democratic Parties that are organized in all the states. One regrettable result of the quarrel is that it gives the enemies of labor valuable ammunition for their charge that trade unionism and communism are identical. This is less important than it seems, however. When you get down to that political level, the truth or falsity of any charge is of little importance.

State Is Reorganized

The reorganization of the Department of State is apparently planned to meet one of the most frequent criticisms of its activities—that lines of responsibility and function were not clear, so that those at the top often did not know what was going on in the Department, and important tendencies or decisions which seemed to be at odds with the nation's interests were often adopted almost by inadvertence, or because of the personal bias of some subordinate.

When Mr. Stettinius was appointed Undersecretary, it was generally understood that one of his main functions was to bring administrative order into the Department, and if this is the result of his effort to do so, we may wish him success. It should be noted that very little change in personnel has occurred, however; the men already there have merely been reshuffled. In so far as those in high positions were responsible for faulty decisions, we may expect more of the same kind. Mr. Stettinius will have performed at least some service if he renders the responsibility clear and undeniable.

Soldiers' Morale

No doubt the men and women at the front are deeply concerned with what goes on at home, and are worried when it does not appear that we are backing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them up sufficiently. But it seems to us that there is a danger that controversialists here will exploit the soldiers' morale to ride their own hobbies. As a matter of fact, there is little means of finding out what those in the ranks as a whole think of this, that or the other question, whether it is the denial of mailing privileges to Esquire by the Post Office or the supposed dangers to the American home. We know, for instance, that some of them are outraged by the talk of strikes, and yet many of them are union members and would not want the labor organizations to be weakened. Furthermore, the supplies and weapons they are receiving must be evidence to them that millions are conscientiously working. One of the obligations to the fighting forces on the part of those at home is not to inflate domestic quarrels far above lifesize by the use of unsubstantiated assertions about the opinions of those who at the moment are too busy to speak for themselves.

Taxes

Despite two pleas in one week from the President to write a real tax law, Congress shows no signs of mending its coddle-the-rich policies. The President dwelt on the importance of taxes in a program for economic stabilization in his message to the new session of the Seventy-eighth Congress and a few days later went into even more detail on our tax needs in his budget message. Even between the two messages, the Senate was busy approving parts of the outrageously inadequate program which had been brought before it by Senator George's Finance Committee. And even after the budget message, reiterating the necessity of at least the $10,500,000,000 Treasury tax program which was tossed aside this year, the Senate continued approving various parts of the pending George bill which will not raise a fifth of that amount. A strong movement is on in the Senate to save the renegotiation law for which the President entered a special plea. There is a chance of success for the administration on that item.

The President's recent tax pronouncements were more than he had made on taxes before. But they still do not represent sufficient action from the White House if he really means what he said about the kind of tax program we must have to escape inflation. As yet the administration has not given Walter George and his cronies from the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce a real fight. It should.

The Great Vote Robbery

The poll-tax Democrats and the Joe Pew Republicans are winning their struggle to deprive our fighting men and women of a chance to vote by means of a simplified federal ballot. The House Committee on Elections, which had been relied on to improve the useless "states' rights" bill passed by the Senate, has now favorably reported that identical bill out for consideration of the whole House, and some members, led by Rep. John Rankin of Mississippi, are pushing for a gag rule for the bill which would forbid any amendments from the floor.

The House committee reported out the old Senate bill over the protests of its chairman, Rep. Eugene Worley (D, Texas), and four other Democrats. The four Republican members of the committee present when the vote was taken, led by Colonel McCormick's pet, Rep. Charles Vursell, joined with three poll-tax Democrats, led by John Rankin, to force an action which Rep. Worley declared "will destroy the morale of our troops more than all the bullets, bombs and propaganda of the enemy."

Careful observers on Capitol Hill report that since the Christmas holidays public protests against the states'-righters' sabotage of the soldiers' vote have fallen off alarmingly. Public pressure, which was having effect before the recess, must be resumed and greatly increased if the House is to be committed to a soldiers' ballot under federal supervision for '44.

The Colonial Problem

Julian Huxley's article on the colonial problem on page 106 of this issue is interesting for several reasons. It gives some facts about colonies that will be new to nearly all Americans. It also shows the direction of thinking on this question of British liberals, of whom Mr. Huxley is a good representative.

No informed person can doubt that the colonial problem is one of extreme difficulty. No one can doubt either that many years will be required for a satisfactory solution. It is worth remembering, however, that Mr. Huxley is thinking mostly of colonies in or near equatorial Africa, where the problem is tougher than almost anywhere else. There are some colonies in other parts of the world that are much nearer to self-government. If we include India, as we are entitled to do morally though not technically, we have a country whose inhabitants are very nearly ready to throw off the foreign yoke by force of arms, and with a good chance of success.

Any reasonable American would agree with Mr.

"Look, I'm as tall as you."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Huxley that some other empires treat their colonies worse than do the British. He would agree also that the problem of doing away with imperialism is world-wide, and that no great nation should be exempt from its share of the responsibility. Perhaps the chief difference between American and European thinking is that the American is resolutely convinced that complete freedom at some future date, however distant, is both possible and desirable; the European perhaps believes this, but he rarely emphasizes it. The American remembers our experience with the Philippines. Over and over again we were told that the Filipino was hopelessly unfit for self-government. Then—for no altruistic reason, to be sure—we set a date for freedom, and the talk about the unfitness of the Filipino promptly died away. It is only natural that Americans should feel that a parallel experience may be witnessed with colonies of various nations, in various parts of the world, once public opinion gets up to the point of seriously discussing their freedom.

Race Discrimination in New York

A hotel manager in New York City has been fined $100 for refusing to rent a room to a Negro; a suit for civil damages against the manager and the hotel will follow. So far as is known, this is the first case of its kind in New York City. We do not doubt that the manager in question was acting under orders and is not personally responsible. At the same time, we welcome the fact that he was found guilty and a fine imposed. New York State has a law which in theory guarantees equal rights to all citizens. With a few more cases of this sort, perhaps the state will begin to take it seriously.

The Post Office and View

On the heels of Postmaster General Walker's denial of the second-class mailing privilege to Esquire magazine comes a similar ban on View, an avant-garde magazine devoted to literature and the arts. Although no reason was advanced for the suppression of the current issue, it is more than likely that one or another of three nudes—by Michelangelo, Picasso and Leon Kelly, a young American artist—gave offense to the authorities. Apart from the issues raised by censorship in general and the specific fitness of Mr. Walker as an art critic or public moralist, the ban is manifestly unfair, since artistic representation of the human body in various states of undress can be found in a number of publications that enjoy the second-class mailing privilege. From a practical standpoint, the suppression of View is more serious than the Esquire affair. The latter magazine is wealthy and extremely popular. At least one publicist—a Republican politician—claims that its suppression is a greater blow to soldier morale than the threatened loss of the voting privilege. View has, however, a very small circulation, restricted largely to artists, writers and scholars. The prompt restoration of its second-class permit is imperative as evidence that the rights of minorities—even artistic and literary minorities—are secure.

Workers Across the Sea

Four United States war workers have recently returned from a month's visit to Britain spent in British war plants, workers' homes and United States military installations abroad. Now four rank-and-file British trade unionists have in return come back with the Americans to have a look at our war industry. This international exchange of visits is sponsored jointly by the Office of War Information and the British Information Services, with the coöperation of the labor movements of both countries. The four United States workers, chosen by the OWI and their local unions, come from aviation motors, steel and chemical plants. Two of them are AFL men, two CIO. In Great Britain, they spent most of their time in plants of their own industries, but they also observed American military operations there.

The Americans are now on their way back to their old jobs to tell their fellow workers what they saw and learned. Undoubtedly they will repeat to their local unions one thing they told the British press, that labor-management relations in England are on a "more concrete basis than in the United States." "Labor in Great Britain seems to be more generally recognized and more firmly established, so that negotiations are carried on with each side recognizing the problems of the other," said an AFL chemical worker from East St. Louis. He went on to remark that workers in England are "thinking comprehensively and constructively about labor's part in the postwar world," and that "British trade unionists have definite ideas of the part they are to play."

The President Points the Way

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S report to Congress on the state of the nation is a remarkable document; it may loom larger in history than any other of his state papers. For the President has at last done what so many of his friends have long urged him to do—he has appealed to the American people as a whole over the heads, and regardless of the wishes, of any and all political pressure groups. If this Congress refuses to accept his five-point program—which seems almost certain—he has written a magnificent platform for the next presidential election, for himself or any other candidate.

More than one commentator has pointed out that if the President himself intends to run, this new program is one of unparalleled boldness. In a campaign year, you are supposed to placate labor, to keep down taxes,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to leave profits alone or increase them. The President, on the contrary, has demanded an increase in taxes five times larger than Congress is willing to grant. He demands food subsidies, to which the farm bloc is opposed. He wants the government to retain the power to renegotiate war contracts, which is a blow at profits. He wants a national-service act, which is, at least for the present, highly unpopular with some of the leaders of labor. In short, his proposals will please nobody except the plain, patriotic people of the United States, who want the burden of war shared as equitably as possible, want victory speeded, want their fathers, brothers and sons home again as quickly as possible and back in decent jobs at decent wages.

The President outlined in his message a "Second Bill of Rights," the attaining of which could keep the country busy for years to come. The President asks for every individual who wants it, a good job at good wages; a decent living for every farmer; a fair chance for every business man; proper housing and adequate medical care for all; protection in case of unemployment, accidental injury, illness and old age; the right to a good education. These are reasonable and modest demands when we consider the natural resources, technological progress and trained skills available in this country. No man should be elected President, under whatever party banner, on any platform less sweeping.

Of the five-point program for Congress, the first four items need little discussion in The New Republic. We have repeatedly pointed out why they are necessary. The failure of Congress to impose adequate taxes is piling up the burden for future generations and creating both an immediate inflation and the danger that it will be greatly increased. The present law on renegotiation of contracts, which Congress proposes to abrogate, prevents some of the more outrageous profiteering on war orders. Food subsidies prevent runaway prices and encourage maximum production. The stabilization law which expires next June is the backbone of the government fight against inflation.

The last point is the most controversial—the national-service plan, under which every citizen would be subject to the orders of the federal government as completely (in theory) as is the soldier on the battlefield. Organized labor has opposed this measure in the past. It has cited the remarkable diminution in strikes during the war to prove that labor is patriotically doing its duty.

If Congress were to pass a national-service act without adopting the other four points in the President's program, we should agree with the opposition of the trade-union leaders. For in that case, the national-service act would become no more than a strike-breaking law of the kind favored by such bitter labor haters as Rep. Howard W. Smith of Virginia. All reasonable men know that such laws are useless. No democracy has ever succeeded in preventing strikes by law. The dictatorships prevent them only by shooting those who take part; and even the dictatorships are unable to stop the slowdowns which so seriously curtail output.

In calling for a national-service act at this time, the President may be thinking of the serious problems that will arise as the war reaches its close. The greatest labor shortage is probably behind us, so far as the war industries are concerned. As the end of the conflict comes in sight, however, there may be a scramble among workers to get peacetime jobs, and this may endanger the war work that is still going forward. A national-service act might help to bridge this gap in an orderly fashion.

If such an act is preceded by passage of the President's four-point program, we think labor would be well advised to accept the proposal. The workers have already pledged themselves against strikes in wartime; and that pledge has been broken only under the pressure of economic necessity, when the workers felt they were receiving unjust treatment, with rising prices that outran rising wages. The President's program would guarantee a continuing equilibrium between wages and prices. It would not prevent increased pay envelopes for those whose wages are now substandard. Acceptance of a national-service act under these circumstances would be a token of loyalty that would have enormous and continuing value in healing the rift that has developed between labor and the rest of the community. Such a national-service act, moreover, would have some value in relation to the rest of the community. It should help to hasten the end of the war. Since, as we pointed out above, it is very doubtful whether this Congress will enact any part of the President's five-point program, we should like to see organized labor fight vigorously in the next election for members who will carry out this program and will then proceed to the fulfilment of the President's magnificent Second Bill of Rights.

Russia in Europe

RELATIONS BETWEEN RUSSIA and Poland have now reached a complete impasse. On January 11, Russia offered Poland an eastern frontier substantially the same as the "Curzon Line." To compensate her for the loss of territory in the east, she would get land now occupied by Germany in the west. At the same time, Poland was invited to join the new Russo-Czecho-Slovak alliance. Russia sharply criticized the Polish Government-in-Exile, situated in London.

The Poles, and apparently the British as well, ignored the criticism of the Polish Government-in-Exile. After long consultation with British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, this Polish government on January 14 asked the United States and Great Britain to mediate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the border issue. It denied, however, the Russian claim to territory between the Curzon Line and the 1939 Russo-Polish frontier, which was much farther to the east.

Russia has now made the reply to this proposal that might have been expected. She flatly rejects the Polish offer and insists on the Curzon Line. No negotiation is possible, she argues, with a government with whom diplomatic relations have been broken, and she accuses the Polish Government-in-Exile of not wanting "good-neighborly relations." A point at issue between the two governments has been the accusation, originally circulated by the Nazis, that the Russians had put to death 10,000 to 15,000 Polish soldiers at Katyn, in the Smolensk area. The Russians accused the Polish Government-in-Exile of "slander" in connection with this charge. A commission has recently been appointed in Moscow to investigate the alleged mass killing, which the Russians have from first to last consistently denied.

Where do we stand? Very much where we were before. From beginning to end, the Russians have insisted that the territory east of the Curzon Line is Russian, by historic claim, by nationality of a majority of the inhabitants and by preference expressed in plebiscites. They don't intend to have the subject mediated or arbitrated by anybody, and this was the real significance of the seemingly tactless criticism of Wendell Willkie for his well meant article in The New York Times. Furthermore, the Russians intend to do everything they can—and they can obviously do a great deal—to obtain a liberal and democratic, pro-Russian government for Poland, beginning, no doubt, with the Union of Polish Patriots in Moscow.

From sources in this country that have always been hostile to Russia we are hearing loud cries that she is violating her obligations under the Atlantic Charter and the agreements of Teheran. As to the first of these, we know that Russia made some reservations when she signed the Atlantic Charter, indicating that she did not consider that it applied to certain of her interests and claims. As for the agreements of Teheran, nobody knows exactly what was promised there. There is no reason to believe that Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt raised the question of the Soviet Union's western boundary or that, if they did, Stalin made any promises to them incompatible with the present action.

It is obviously true that Russia at this moment is relying upon her own strength and upon arrangements she herself can make with her neighbors, for her security in the postwar world. This is not incompatible with some subsequent scheme for definite collective security, or with her commitments to Great Britain under the Anglo-Russian alliance. The Russians have undoubtedly felt some hostility to themselves, in both the British and the American governments, in the past. They do not close the doors to a future firm understanding with those powers; but neither do they propose to wait indefinitely with the doors open—especially as regards the Baltic area, where the Russians feel that their claim is as good as was that of France to Alsace in 1918.

Anglo-American diplomacy in the recent past would seem to have been inept, to say the least. While Russians were doing the greater part of the fighting and dying in our common war against Germany, our political leaders seemed determined to treat the USSR as a stepchild as long and as much as possible. We ignored her wishes regarding Italy until the Moscow conference. In Yugoslavia, we put our money on the reactionary Mihailovich, until his failure and Tito's success made this course ridiculous in the eyes of the world. In Greece, we are still, in opposition to Russian policy, halfway supporting a King whom the Greeks obviously do not want and who condoned a Fascist regime as completely as did Victor Emmanuel in Italy.

Moscow and Teheran represented tremendous forward steps, in that we abandoned the more patent forms of our anti-Russian activities and came to a more or less firm understanding on military matters, though it is far from certain that our commitment at Teheran regarding a western front was as positive as the Russians desired. It is no belittling of Moscow and Teheran to say, however, that Great Britain and the United States, having passed from political hostility to political neutrality, have not yet—in spite of the Anglo-Russian treaty—taken the next step to genuine political coöperation of a sort that would convince Russia she can safely entrust her future to collective security underwritten by the two great Western powers.

Unless and until we are prepared to take such a step, we shall see a continuation of what will look to the outside world like fairly ruthless power politics by Moscow and will look to the Russians themselves like minimum action in their own safety, in collaboration with the most democratic elements to be found in the populations of neighboring countries.

America and France

For reasons known only to our State Department, the French Committee of National Liberation is still the stepchild of the United Nations. Instead of improving, political relations between the committee and the United States have progressively deteriorated in the last few weeks and are now reported to be at a complete standstill. This development is unfortunate. It greatly aggravates the task of the French Committee, which is eager to reach an agreement concerning its role in liberated France, and whose efforts are seri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ously impeded by the unsympathetic attitude of the Americans. It adds fuel to the fire of the growing antagonism between Free French and Americans in North Africa. If political hostility has not harmed military coöperation, this has been due to the good sense of the military men on both sides, but especially General Eisenhower.

Perhaps the worst aspect of the State Department's negative attitude toward the French Committee is that it increases the suspicion of many French patriots, in occupied France and in North Africa, who still fear the possibility that the United States may again deal with Vichy or some disguised government patterned after it. The Free French have not forgotten that only a year ago they figured very little in the State Department's scheme of things and that they were "let in" only after it had become unmistakably clear that General de Gaulle alone could rally all democratic Frenchmen in North Africa to the cause of the United Nations.

One of the principal obstacles to an understanding between the State Department and the French Committee is the unwillingness of the former to admit the failure of its North African policy. American officials apparently resent the rough handling by the committee's "Purge Commission" of some of their earlier collaborators like Pierre Boisson, Marcel B. Peyrouton, Pierre Pucheu and other Vichyites. They feel that these men loyally coöperated with the Allies after the North African invasion. What they forget and what the Free French remember is that the Vichyites in North Africa once collaborated with the Germans and came over to the Allied side only after they had no other alternative. From the Free French point of view they are politically untrustworthy. Yet the arrest of Boisson and Flandin, according to a dispatch of Harold Callender in The New York Times of January 8, 1944, "offended Washington."

Behind this narrow-minded personalism on the part of State Department officials responsible for our French policy is of course their political blindness to what is happening in France. They have either not realized or cannot admit that the French people are not just fighting a war of liberation against the German invader, but also a civil war against Vichy and all that was bad in the Third French Republic. They fail to see that the committee in Algiers derives its strength from the backing it receives from the overwhelming majority of Frenchmen in occupied France, and that it is as representative as, if not more so than, some of the fully recognized governments-in-exile. Their lack of sympathy for the desires of the French people can only have the one effect of intensifying the nationalism of the already highly sensitive French Committee and thus sabotaging friendly relations between this country and liberated France.

In contrast to the State Department, the French Committee has shown a keen sense of realism in recent weeks. After initial bungling, it intelligently handled the Lebanese question, which threatened its friendly relations with the British. It decided to postpone the purge trials until after the liberation of France, possibly to please the State Department and facilitate an understanding. It withstood the pressure of the Communists, who have been clamoring for a transformation of the committee into a provisional government without Allied consent. And it did not hesitate to submit its plans and actions to the Consultative Assembly, where it has come in for some severe criticism. But in spite of these manifestations of good will and democratic intent, the committee's role in liberated France has remained as uncertain as it was some months ago.

That this uncertainty regarding the committee's role in the impending invasion of France cannot continue indefinitely is obvious. The committee is the only administrative body politically acceptable to the people of liberated France. As the State Department seems to insist on its negative attitude, the committee is looking for friends elsewhere. The visit of President Benes of Czecho-Slovakia to Algiers after his journey to Moscow strengthens the assumption that he may have been sounding out the committee regarding an alliance between France and the Soviet Union, which he had always advocated. And the scheduled meeting between General de Gaulle and Prime Minister Churchill suggests that the committee is turning to Great Britain for a definition of its status upon the liberation of France. Only a bold reversal of the State Department's recalcitrant attitude toward the French Committee can assure the United States that influence in the future of France which it should have in view of the two nations' historic friendship and the military sacrifices American armies may be expected to make in the liberation of that country.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Colonies and Freedom[1]

Readers of Fielding's "Tom Jones" will remember Parson Thwackum's dictum about religion: "When I say religion, I mean the Christian religion; and when I say the Christian religion, I mean the Protestant religion; and when I say the Protestant religion, I mean the Church of England." Somewhat similarly, when certain American liberals say imperialism, they mean British imperialism; and when they say British imperialism, they mean British colonial imperialism; and when they say British colonial imperialism, they mean the jingoism of the Cecil Rhodes and Kipling brand. They forget the Commonwealth of Dominions, each an independent sovereign state, free to stay out of war (like Eire) if they so desire. They also forget French, Dutch, Belgian, Portuguese, Italian, Spanish and other imperialisms. How many Americans know that the British colonies are exceeded in area by the French, and in population by the Dutch? Why is it not recalled that administration and general conditions are worse, sometimes far worse, in the colonies of certain other powers than in the British?

In the second place, the critics of British imperialism generally persist in thinking in terms of political freedom alone. They neglect the fact that economic and social development are equally or even more important. And they forget to ask, *freedom for whom?* Political freedom for Kenya would at the moment imply freedom for the small minority of white settlers to run the country. Freedom for Nigeria might mean freedom for the feudal Mohammedan Emirs, or for the tiny minority of educated Coast Negroes. Liberia is "free"; but in practice this freedom means that the mass of tribal Negroes are ruled by an inefficient and corrupt minority of emancipated slaves, with the influence of white big business looming in the background.

All this is not an excuse for British or any other imperialism: it is a plea to look at the colonial problem realistically, against the background of historical and economic facts. The establishment of colonies in the modern world was one of the results of white capitalist expansion. This expansion continued all through the nineteenth century. But whereas the overcrowded countries of Europe could only expand either by sending emigrants abroad or by seizing new lands in the tropics, the United States was able to expand within the boundaries of its own subcontinent. Do not let us forget, however, that even this internal expansion was only achieved by means of purchase, a war, and expropriation of the Indians. The United States is the American Empire.

So much for the past. The present, or at any rate the very recent past, is characterized by the apparent end of expansionism. The frontiers, it seems, have been reached and filled. But people are beginning to realize that expansion can continue if it changes its aim, and that there are other kinds of frontier than the merely physical frontier or indeed than the trade frontier. There is the frontier of standard of living: and this is not limited to the two-dimensional surface of the earth, but occupies a third dimension, of human welfare, in which expansion can continue indefinitely.

The colonial question, in fact, has in its economic aspect now become a part of the much broader problem of the development of backward areas, which in its turn is one of the two basic problems of our times—the problem of overcoming the restrictionist tendencies of monopoly capitalism and launching world economics once more on the tide of expansionism.

But the colonies have always had a military side too. Gibraltar, Malta, Wake Island and Hawaii are strategic colonies. Various parts of Africa were taken over by one nation because of the strategic dangers caused by the threat of occupation by another power. In this aspect the colonial question becomes a part of the other basic problem of the present—that of international security.

Neither the economic and social development of colonies nor their security can be adequately achieved except on the basis of some measure of international cooperation. What is more, the coöperation must include not only colonies, but other territories and their problems as well. The most interesting suggestion that has yet been made is that colonial affairs should, with much else, come under the general control of Regional Councils, on which would be represented the main powers with economic and security interests in the region, together perhaps with some nations which had no major interests there. In addition, the Council should contain representatives of the indigenous peoples of the region, whether these enjoyed real or nominal independence or were still of colonial status.

The Regional Councils themselves would of course be related to whatever world-scale system or organizations were set up after the war. The most detailed formulation of this policy has been made by a committee of the Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations held at Mont Tremblant in December, 1942.[1] The committee, we are told, "was composed in part of members who had shown the most divergent views at the start." In other words, it included some of the most ardent American critics of British imperialism as well as members of the British and other European delegations.

The committee was considering only the Pacific Re-

[1] Comment on this article appears in the editorial section. – THE EDITORS

[1] A preliminary report of the Conference has been published by the Institute under the title, "War and Peace in the Pacific," $1.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gion, but its conclusions are just as applicable elsewhere. What I have called the Regional Council is by it styled "the International Authority." In the following quotations I have added the word "Regional" to mark the distinction from the World International Authority. The committee agreed that

> there cannot be a divorce of power from responsibility. If the present colonial powers are to remain solely responsible for the security of the peoples concerned and for their economic and social progress, then it is obvious that they cannot accept direction from outside parties, which involve those parties in no collateral responsibility. If, however, the larger of the outside parties were prepared to accept, as part of an international system, their proportionate share of responsibility for the security and economic development of the peoples concerned, the feeling of the group was that the colonial powers should and would be prepared to grant more than merely advisory powers to the Regional International Authority. But such assurances are essential. . . .

The "more than advisory powers" suggested by the committee are very far-reaching. Though actual administrative and legislative responsibility are expressly left in the hands of the colonial powers, the powers of the Regional International Authority include the right to suggest to any colonial power in the region general lines of policy leading toward self-government and toward economic and social well being; the right to receive periodic reports on how such policies are being made and planned in the evolution toward complete self-government and the duty of publishing these with its own comments; the right to maintain a permanent secretariat and technical staff who would among other things make reports on periodic inspections of the colonial areas, and be able to investigate on the spot the grievances of any indigenous group; in addition, they would be available for advice on all technical problems.

If other nations should not be willing to assume their share of responsibility, the powers of the Regional Council would of course be much more shadowy—at best perhaps similar to those of the Mandates Commission of the League.

I should add that there is absolutely no support forthcoming, even in the most progressive unofficial groups, or among the colonial peoples themselves, for the notion of handing colonies over—lock, stock and barrel—into the charge of an International Administration. The native peoples fear that this might readily become a more dangerous, because a more impersonal, agency for perpetuating white domination than the present system. It would almost certainly result in grave administrative troubles: handling primitive peoples is a tricky business, and the break of continuity and administrative tradition would be very serious. And finally it would be utopian to hand over executive responsibilities to an untried body: how could the colonial powers be satisfied that an International Administration, however pretty it looked on paper, could carry out its economic and strategic duties adequately?

There is, however, a good deal of support in some quarters for a measure of progressive internationalization. It would be a gesture of very real significance if the colonial powers would throw open a certain percentage of the posts in their service to members of other nationalities. A beginning might be made with the technical and scientific services, the percentage being increased as time went on; and eventually the same arrangement could be introduced for the administrative service also.

I must also quote the committee's final comment:

> Implied in the whole of the foregoing there is one point of such basic importance that it must be formulated as an explicit proposition. The whole position regarding economic development and strategic security is conditioned, and indeed largely determined, by the willingness of the great powers, and in particular the United States of America, to assume their responsibilities in a system of security and economic coöperation in this as in other parts of the world.

Do not let us forget that the colonies would much prefer to be governed by their own people than by an alien administration, however admirably international. In this field, British colonial policy has advanced considerably. All posts in the administration, up to the highest, are to be open to the local inhabitants, subject only to their possessing proper qualifications. Already in the Gold Coast there are Negro heads of departments, with white men working under them. But before there can be any adequate supply of native administrators, there must be more and better education. I sometimes wonder if Americans realize the immensity of the educational task in colonial areas. In tropical Africa, for instance, not more than about 10 percent of the tens of millions of children get any schooling at all, and much of what is provided is still of the Bush Mission School variety.

It is a sign of the new interest in colonial problems here that the British government, at the crisis of the war, has recently appointed two strong commissions. One is to investigate the possibility of linking up research and higher education in the colonies with the universities and other institutions at home, so as to build up a unified empire system in which the men working in the colonies would no longer feel intellectually and professionally cut off, and the universities at home would begin to realize the interest of the colonies and the stimulus to research which their problems provide. The other, on which I have the good fortune to serve, is being sent out to West Africa to report on the future of higher education in that huge area.

Critics may ask why Britain has not provided more and better education. Some of them may forget that British rule in most of her African colonies dates back less than half a century, and that a subcontinent that had remained for the most part in an early stage of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barbarism, without written language, the plow, the wheel, or stone building cannot be provided with the intellectual (or material) equipment of the modern world in a few decades. The main reason for the slow progress of education is a financial one. With the exception of a few areas of mineral wealth, tropical Africa is a poor country. Even when there are potential riches, these need considerable capital expenditure for their development. Even if teachers were available, which they are not, the cost of an adequate and universal educational system would at the present moment be quite beyond the resources of any colony, British or otherwise (with the exception of a few "strategic colonies").

One of the things that I take considerable pride in as an Englishman is that in 1940, that *annus terribilis*, Parliament initiated a new phase in British colonial policy by passing the Colonial Development and Welfare Act. There had previously been a small development grant from the British exchequer to the colonies; but this had been confined to undertakings which were expected to yield commercial profit. In 1940, the scope of development was enlarged to include social welfare, health and education, and the annual sum expendable was raised to £5,500,000, of which £500,000 was earmarked for research. There is now general agreement among progressive thinkers that this allocation is not nearly big enough, but it represents a great advance.

As an example of what has already been done during the war under the Act, I would like to mention the grant this year of £127,00 to set up a West African Institute of Arts, Industries and Social Sciences. This is of great significance in several ways. For one thing, it represents our first large-scale encouragement of secondary industry among the backward peoples under our colonial rule. Tiles, pottery and stoneware are already being manufactured locally to save shipping space and to meet the increasing military and civilian needs, and now a local textile industry is to be set up.

But the methods are as important as the bare facts. For seven years Dr. Meyerowitz has been busy trying to discover how to combine the traditions of Africa with the white man's inventions and techniques. At Achimota College he gathered round him a number of African artists and craftsmen from the chief's courts, and also a number of technical experts from England. Under their joint influence he trained young Africans, and when the time was ripe sent them out to start African cooperatives to make goods for sale. I have seen specimens of the stoneware thus produced—latex cups for the United Africa Company, mugs and plates for the troops, water-coolers and the like—and they are of an admirable design, as well as cheap and strong. Already the Africans are experiencing a new confidence in themselves. They are producing things which they enjoy making, which they know to be good, which the white man is willing to pay good money for. African artistic traditions have been preserved without degenerating into the production of art-crafty curios, and Western scientific techniques have been introduced without disrupting the basis of African life and ideas. The new has been grafted on to the old instead of destroying it, and from the operation we may hope to see develop a genuine West African culture, able to make its distinctive contribution to the world of the future.

The social and cultural problem is basic. It is useless thinking in purely political terms. Take Nigeria, for instance. Obviously a black man's country. Twenty million people who somehow have to take their place in the modern world. Great numbers of tribes living in a primitive stage of paganism, subsisting by a primitive agriculture. A good many powerful Mohammedan Emirates, constructed on a pattern extremely similar to that of the European feudal system, and in many ways reminiscent of early medieval Europe. A fringe of highly educated Negroes in the coastal towns. The demands of the world for the utilization of the country's natural resources—the palm oil and kernels, the tin, the coal, the bauxite, with the resultant development of a pool of native labor. The demands of the war, leading to the creation of an army not only of soldiers but of of technicians and skilled and semi-skilled workmen. And finally the permeation by airplane across the continent from west to east, bringing new life and new ideas to ancient walled cities such as Kano. In all this whirl of change there is a real danger of the collapse of the old traditional structures into a formless chaos.

It is, I think, clear that the first bulwark against chaos, and the foundation for organic future development, must be economic. The people of the colonies (and not just the administration, or the intelligentsia and the chiefs, or the trading companies and foreign capital) must be prosperous. They must be brought to realize that they can attain a new security and a new standard of living and health and interest, and that this is more worth while than the old.

New organizations and new legislation are also necessary. The British government in the last few years has deliberately encouraged the formation of Negro trade unions, and during the war has sent out British trade-union representatives to encourage the movement on the spot. It has encouraged the separate colonies to enact modern labor legislation, on hours, wages, conditions, the prevention of forced labor and the like, and over this it works in close coöperation with the International Labor Office. It has this year set up a strong Committee on Social Welfare whose first action has been to arrange for a two-year course in London for the training of Africans and members of other native colonial peoples as welfare officers.

There is plenty of room for private capital to aid in the development of the colonies, but, as Colonel Stanley, the Colonial Secretary, said in a recent important interview, it will have to operate under proper con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol. Most people consider that "proper control" means restriction of profits to a certain moderate percentage, with the compulsory plowing-back of anything above this into the colonial territories. Restriction of profits would be the *quid pro quo* for greater security. Proper control would also mean acceptance of various regulations concerning the welfare of native labor and of the local communities in general.

Colonel Stanley also stated that he thought that public capital, in the shape of grants from the British exchequer, will be needed for "basic developments" in the British colonies—in other words, for the physical equipment of colonial areas. Without more roads, harbors, dams, power plants, warehouses and processing facilities, schools, hospitals and schemes of agricultural credit, they cannot make their economic contribution to the world. And private capital cannot be expected to do much toward providing these.

There remains the international side. In many areas, the colonial system has led to an illogical jigsaw of territories, administered by different colonial powers, along differing lines, and also sometimes on very different levels of efficiency and humanity. In the huge areas of Africa administered by Portugal, systems of forced labor virtually indistinguishable from slavery existed up to the war and presumably still do so. In West Africa, political boundaries cut across tribes, civilizations, and the natural trends of geographical and economic forces. This is one reason why regionalism is needed—to coördinate the unnatural patchwork produced by the workings of nationalist expansion into something more organic and better adapted to modern conditions. The other reason is that the colonies must be fitted into the framework of a world policy of military security and economic expansion; and for this, strong regional arrangements under a loose world organization are most suitable. For the former, a combination of colonial powers would perhaps suffice. For the latter, the participation of other powers is essential.

It remains for some American to do for the economic and political development of colonies what Walter Lippmann has done for foreign policy—demonstrate in detail the need for the balancing of American commitments against American responsibilities. The problems are of course somewhat different. In the colonial sphere, American commitments are largely moral. Yet criticism and advice, however high-minded, are in their own way commitments. They cannot be balanced except by the assumption of corresponding moral responsibility, and moral responsibility is empty unless it carries with it material responsibility. If imperialism in its old guise is an ugly thing, or at least has its ugly aspects, the United States will continue to carry some responsibility for its continuance so long as it fails to cooperate actively in the effort to transform it into a campaign for the all-around development of backward areas and backward peoples.

London JULIAN HUXLEY

The Future of Austria

SOME THREE MONTHS have gone by since the Moscow conference of the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States informed the world that the three Allied powers "are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination." That Austria should be one of the subjects discussed at and agreed on by the first joint conference of the Anglo-American bloc and the Soviet Union is in itself proof of the importance which the future of this little country is considered to have for the pacification of the European continent.

In spite of the far-reaching political significance of the "Declaration on Austria," it has not been given sufficient critical attention. Commentators were apparently more impressed by the successful achievement of Allied unity than by the content of a declaration which seemed only an incidental expression of that achievement. Unfortunately, all is not well with the "Declaration." Its formulation is in some respects either inadequate or confusing. Hence it may seriously threaten Allied agreement on the future of Austria.

The "Declaration on Austria" has a dual aspect. It is a statement of Allied policy regarding the political future of Austria and it is also an instrument of immediate political warfare. Apart from its long-range-policy implications, its effectiveness as an instrument of political warfare depends to a large extent on the soundness of the policy which the Allied powers have pledged themselves to pursue. The "Declaration" announced that the three Allied powers "regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date." This statement has come in for some severe and justified criticism from Austrians themselves, especially exiled Socialists.

By refusing to recognize any changes effected in Austria since her incorporation into Germany, the Allied powers would seem to legitimize the regime of Dollfuss and Schuschnigg which ruled Austria from 1934 on. This dictatorship in effect destroyed Austria's democratic republic and transformed her into a colony of Mussolini which the latter at his convenience handed over to Hitler. The "Declaration on Austria" cannot

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and must not imply the revival of this dictatorship. Nor can it mean the restoration of the Hapsburgs—not quite an impossibility in view of our State Department's long-standing flirtation with the Austrian pretender. "We believe," writes Austrian Labor Information, organ of the Austrian Labor Committee in New York City, in its November-December, 1943, issue, "that in view of the tremendous changes presently taking place in Europe, neither of these two reactionary attempts would have the slightest chance of success. But we assert nevertheless: Austria was a democratic republic as long as she was free and independent—only this Austria can be restored again."

Socialist apprehension over the failure of the "Declaration on Austria" to be explicit concerning the future political regime which the Allies hope to see established in Austria is justified. Could the omission of a demand for a democratic Austria have been intentional? This question is particularly to the point, since the Moscow Conference's "Declaration regarding Italy" promised the Italian people "every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles." Moreover, a political program which has recently come out of Austria and was first published in the December 2, 1943, issue of the Volksrecht of Zurich, Switzerland, suggests that the Austrian underground desires a free and independent Austria only if she is to have a democratic constitution.

Perhaps even more unfortunate is the "Declaration's" formulation of Austria's future international status. It stated that the Allied powers hoped that the reëstablishment of a free and independent Austria would "open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for a lasting peace." The varying interpretations which this statement has received in England and the United States, on the one hand, and in the Soviet Union, on the other, indicate disagreement as to its meaning.

On November 6, 1943, an editorial in The New York Times declared that the envisaged "coöperation for 'political and economic security' between Austria and her neighbor states" is "a promise that renewed efforts in that direction would find support from all the three powers, including Russia, which previously had opposed all 'federation' plans in eastern Europe." On November 10 The New Statesman and Nation (London) interpreted the "Declaration" as meaning "that Russia no longer objects against all groupings of the central and east European states." And on November 11 The (London) Economist went so far as to suggest that the "Declaration" might become the basis for a Danubian confederation. These Anglo-American interpretations were sharply rebuked in an authoritative article in the Soviet government newspaper, Izvestia, of November 18, 1943, which pointed out that "neither the Declaration on Austria nor any other decisions of the Moscow Conference give the slightest ground for such conclusions." The article reiterated the well known Soviet opposition to all regional agreements which might be directed against the USSR.

In view of the strong political position which the Soviet Union may be expected to occupy in postwar central and southeastern Europe, the Izvestia statement concerning Austria must be accepted as an important factor in a discussion of Austria's international role in the postwar world. But it does not mean, as has been intimated in anti-Soviet circles, that the Soviet Union plans the political atomization of Europe into small, weak states. On the contrary, Soviet policy is directed toward the political and economic integration of central and southeastern Europe. In this integrated area Austria will occupy a pivotal position. For the Soviet government is perfectly aware of the fact that Austria's isolation after the last war was responsible both for her political and economic weakness as well as the almost universal desire of all Austrians—Socialists, Christian Socialists, Democrats—for *Anschluss* with Germany on which Hitler finally capitalized.

Austria is central Europe's door to southeastern Europe. For this reason alone she will have to be integrated with her neighbors into a larger whole. Only the integration of Austria's economy with those of her neighbors, as suggested in the "Declaration," can give meaning to her "political independence." In the case of Austria, "political independence" can only mean independence *from* Germany. In view of the already existing alliance between Czecho-Slovakia, one of her neighbors, with the Soviet Union, and in view of the close relations which may be expected to exist after the war between the new Partisan Yugoslavia, another neighbor, and the Soviet Union, Austria must find her independence from Germany in a Soviet-integrated central and southeastern Europe. This solution would benefit Austria and her neighbor states as well as be acceptable to the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, the supplementary protocol to the pact recently concluded between Czecho-Slovakia and the Soviet Union leaves the door open for Czecho-Slovakia's neighbors to join the agreement. While the protocol has been generally interpreted as containing a bid to Poland, there is no reason why Austria should not become a partner to the agreement.

The element of surprise accompanying the "Declaration on Austria" at the time of its announcement stamped it an instrument of political warfare. This character of the "Declaration" also appears from its third paragraph, which reminds Austria "that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation." The state-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment embodies the well tried propaganda recipe of combining the threat of vengeance with the promise of salvation in order to attain the desired effect.

From a pragmatic point of view, the "Declaration's" warning to the Austrian people to take their salvation into their own hands has undoubtedly had the desired effect. Opposition to the Nazis has greatly increased since November. Anti-Nazi demonstrations have occurred in all parts of Austria and in many instances have assumed threatening proportions, as in the locomotive works at Vienna, the coal mines at Graz and the Danube shipyards at Linz. Peasants in the less accessible mountain regions have refused to deliver to the Germans their stipulated quotas of farm products. Hundreds of Austrian soldiers have been reported deserting, especially in Norway and on the Russian front. Within Austria native troops are no longer considered reliable and are being replaced by German troops needed elsewhere. All indications are to the effect that the Austrian people have made a good start toward extricating themselves from Nazi Germany.

In view of these developments it is doubtful that any responsible pre-Dollfuss and pre-Hitler Austrian statesman, or any democratic Austrian in general, could ever admit the validity of the idea that the Austrian people are responsible for participating in the Nazi war and in Nazi crimes. As a matter of fact, from a legal standpoint there is no "Austria" participating in the war. The Austrian people had no choice in the matter. And from a moral-historical point of view, the people of Austria, except for the Austrian Nazis, are no more responsible for the war than the statesmen of Britain and France—nay, the entire peoples of these two countries—who permitted Hitler first to annex Austria, then Czecho-Slovakia, and then proceed with his war of conquest.

It is for all of these reasons that a new, more explicit and precise statement of Allied plans for Austria is desirable. Such a supplemental statement to the "Declaration on Austria" would have to guarantee to the Austrian people a democratic constitution, clarify Austria's place in Europe's future international set-up and welcome the Austrians, purged of Nazism, as members in the family of the United Nations. It would also be desirable to give some sort of official recognition to the endeavors of exiled democratic Austrians such as the Oesterreichische Vertretungskörperschaft (Austrian Representation), which was established in London on November 9, 1943, with two representatives each from the trade unions, the Socialists, the Catholics (Christian Socialists) and the Democrats. In the United States support should be given to such organizations as the democratic Austrian Action or the Austrian Labor Committee.

HEINZ H. F. EULAU

Labor and Politics

IS THE LABOR VOTE for 1944 safely in Roosevelt's pocket? Shrewd politicians are not so sure of the answer as they were a few weeks ago. Neither is labor.

The various wage disputes—mine, steel and rail—the President's Message to Congress containing a National Service proposal, and the now famous "Marshall incident" have made a difference. The "high-personage" attack on labor and the lack of a real national labor policy have put the administration squarely on the spot. John L. Lewis is delighted at the confusion; the Railway Brotherhoods are spouting fire over an alleged "blitz against rail unions"; the AFL is pretending to flirt with General MacArthur for revenge against Roosevelt and Marshall; CIO leaders are praying that the President will not force them away from his support by allowing labor relations to disintegrate further.

If the elections were held tomorrow, Democratic politicians fear that a large percentage of labor leaders would vote against them. Most of these experts, however, do not even pretend to predict what the rank and file of labor would do, whether they would bother to go to the polls in any greater numbers than in the 1942 and 1943 elections and whether they would follow their leaders or make up their own minds if they did vote.

Outside John L. Lewis' forces, disaffection toward the President and his party is strongest among the railway unions. Recently, their official news organ, Labor, has been almost as vicious in its attacks against Roosevelt as The Mine Workers' Journal. The rail-union journal charges that General Marshall was "used in a scheme to inflame public opinion" and that the President and his assistants, not the unions, are to blame for failing to settle the rail wage disputes.

The AFL has sided with the rail unions both in stating its belief that Marshall was speaking for the White House and in placing the blame for the railway controversy on the President and his lack of a clear policy. But this did not satisfy the AFL publicity experts. They wanted fireworks, so they dug up an old bit of MacArthurana praising labor's part in the war and featured it as a kind of reply to Marshall. Naturally, the stunt backfired when top AFL leaders had to disavow its political implications, but the incident should not be ignored. A few months ago it would have been hard to believe that a responsible labor publication would imply endorsement of MacArthur even in a burst of anger.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are other, more significant AFL political straws in the wind. Daniel Tobin, head of the powerful Brotherhood of Teamsters, who has been head of the Labor Campaign Committee of the Democratic National Committee in all three Roosevelt campaigns, now predicts that Wendell Willkie will be the Republican nominee in 1944 and that he will be elected to the presidency if the war is ended before the first Tuesday after the first Monday next November. Tobin's statement is being widely interpreted as notice that he is no longer to be considered a New Deal camp-follower.

Thus far, largely due to the leadership of Philip Murray, CIO unions, which are not without grievances of their own, have kept their criticisms of the President and administration policies on a higher plane than have the AFL and the Brotherhoods. Murray led his United Steelworkers through a wage crisis as serious as the previous mine and rail crises, with scarcely a lost production hour; he gave the members of his union the unprecedented order to continue their work without a contract because he felt that sufficient government guarantees had been made as to retroactive pay and other basic matters. The insistence of the CIO leadership that not even the Marshall incident be allowed to destroy wartime unity thus far distinguishes its political position from that of the other two labor groups.

However, while doing everything possible to preserve unity between labor and the administration on the war program, Philip Murray has avoided definitely committing either himself or his organization to a fourth term for Roosevelt. It was on his decision that no fourth-term resolution was passed at the last CIO convention. And the statement Sidney Hillman made at the convention, that if the elections were only a few months away, he would "urge, for the sake of humanity, the nation and labor, the nomination and reëlection of Franklin Delano Roosevelt," was made entirely on Hillman's own.

There is every indication that most of the CIO goes along with Hillman. Few realists in the trade-union movement or outside it expect either Hillman or the CIO to wind up anywhere but on the President's side in 1944. There is a small group which will argue that it would be better for the CIO in the long run if a reactionary Republican were to be elected in '44, for then labor would have a definite enemy to fight, a cause around which to rally. A few still cling to the idea that the best course for '44 for labor is to launch its own third party regardless of the political consequences. But practically the whole CIO is together on the first proposition of building strong political-action machinery in every locality.

The CIO Political Action Committee was established last fall to set up that kind of machinery in every ward and precinct of the country, to make sure that both national and local campaigns are fought on real issues, and to organize the progressive forces in support of the candidates who take labor's side on those issues. Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers is chairman of the committee, which includes R. J. Thomas (United Automobile Workers), Van Bittner (United Steelworkers), Sherman Dalrymple (United Rubber Workers) and Albert Fitzgerald (United Electrical Workers). The Political Action Committee starts with a nucleus of 5,000,000 CIO members and their families—something like 14,000,000 potential voters. As President Murray explained in a recent magazine article, the committee is something strictly new under the sun: "It is a new departure for American labor to lead, and pour its funds into, a national movement devoted to the general welfare just as much as to the particular interests of labor groups. . . . We believe that the Political Action Committee . . . will have more influence on events, in the crucial year of 1944, than any third political party could wield. . . . It will continue as a permanent organization, a mighty force devoted to keeping the great majority of Americans vigilant and alert in guarding their proper political interests."

But there are other new angles to the Hillman committee. More important than its scope is the fact that it is the first alternative to the "belly politics" so long in operation as far as labor has been concerned. It has been a truism among professional party politicians that "labor only votes when it is hungry." Results in the well fed election years of 1942 and 1943 bore them out. This Political Action Committee is out to upset that tradition. Neither the AFL nor the Railway Brotherhoods is willing to be a party to this new departure on a national basis. At its executive board meeting late last summer, the AFL considered a proposal for political unity from the CIO. Out came a declaration that: "The American Federation of Labor will not enter into any entangling alliances with the CIO on political action. . . . We cannot afford to jeopardize the success of our own non-partisan political policy by getting mixed up with other organizations not representing the AFL and not guided by its principles."

Fortunately, AFL locals are not handicapped by the high policy considerations which dictate this kind of "isolationist" course for the national body. In communities throughout the country, according to Murray, the Hillman committee "is seeking and obtaining enthusiastic local support from other labor groups. . . ."

The Hillman committee's present intention is to get commitments from candidates on important issues of public policy which are coming up as well as to make judgments of their past performance on strictly labor questions. International coöperation abroad and full employment at home are the cornerstones of the CIO program for 1944. A first step in spelling out the full-employment issue was to call a conference of farmers, business men and professional workers to join with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor representatives in drafting a program for full employment in the reconversion and postwar periods. A later conference to draft a plan for international cooperation will supplement this first part of the program to clarify the political issues ahead. This program will provide the basis for the Hillman committee's immediate actions. Before the national conventions of the two major parties, Murray has revealed, "we shall hold a national meeting or conference of our own. We shall draw up and present to the American people a specific set of principles for the general welfare. Then, after the political conventions, we can decide what action to take regarding the two parties and the individual candidates, whether for state or national offices, or for the presidency."

That is the CIO plan which it is most eager to share with all other labor or liberal groups willing to cooperate. Among its essential demands will be:

A job at union wages, or a farm, business or profession that pays.

A well built home, decently furnished.

Good food, clothing and medical care.

Good schooling for children, with an equal chance for healthy and happy growth.

An income through social insurance in case of unemployment, sickness, old age or the early death of the wage earner.

But plans and programs do not implement themselves, as New Deal politicians learned long ago. The new aspects of the Hillman committee are encouraging and exciting to liberals who have been many months without such a prospect. Now that the time to organize for '44 is already growing short, however, they are becoming impatient at what seems too slow progress. Up to now, the Hillman committee has not even assembled what can be described as a skeleton staff in its national headquarters, though the appointments, thus far, are of the highest caliber. Likewise, the regional directors thus far appointed are, for the most part, superior men, but half the country is still not covered and primaries in many states are almost here. It has been stated that the committee's first drive will be "for registration of voters for all local and national elections in 1944." Many vigorous locals have gone ahead with registration campaigns and, in the South, with campaigns to pay poll taxes, but as yet the committee has not mobilized its full strength behind this necessary first step. Thus far, the Hillman committee has not faced up to the fact that the majority of the votes cast in 1944 will be women's, any more than has the Democratic National Committee. So far, not a single woman has been named to the Hillman committee's staff, and the whole question has been discussed most casually, if at all. There is still time for it to carry through with an all-out registration drive in most states if it starts now.

And there is still time for the Railway Brotherhoods and the AFL to be won back to the Roosevelt standard before the 1944 elections. On the presidential issue, that is. There are many Washington observers who are convinced that both these organizations have already sold most of their local strength in return for congressional support in recent months. The rail unions refused to make any changes in their traditional political rules in the 1940 congressional campaigns to allow for opposing the "isolationists" among their former supporters, and the indications are that rail-union and in some cases AFL support is already guaranteed again to such men, unacceptable to progressives, as Reps. Hamilton Fish and Paul Shafer, and Senators Wheeler and Johnson (Colo.) in return for their smooth speeches upholding the unions in recent fights.

The CIO Political Action Committee is on the right track. It has at last recognized that labor cannot be prosperous unless the whole country is prosperous. But the committee has not yet stepped itself up to the necessary speed, much less brought as many other laborites and liberals as possible into line. The deals which the Brotherhoods and the AFL have been and are entering into with all sorts of representatives on Capitol Hill are definite barriers to honest, unified labor action by local union groups.

Labor will have to move fast if its program for political action is to keep pace with the "years of decision" that lie immediately ahead.

Washington HELEN FULLER

The Major[1]

THEY'D THOUGHT it was just to be another Saturday-morning inspection, but then, at the last moment, an order had come from Battalion Headquarters saying the Major would make a personnel as well as a barracks inspection. That meant each man standing by his bunk and open foot locker.

The barracks, of course, were in fine order—they'd been G. I.'d the night before—and the men had on clean fatigues and leggings, and had haircuts, but it was the foot lockers that had taken up every second of those last minutes.

Even now, the Lieutenant noticed with a flush as he started to follow the Major down the aisle, they were still far from "good." In their haste, the men had forgotten to take down the various photographs, pin-ups and nudes that they'd pinned or pasted to the underside of the locker covers and now he could see a whole row of multi-colored, prominent distractions. "Christ," he thought. The Lieutenant wanted to impress the Major above all else, since the Major was his first important lift to a captaincy.

[1] This is one of a series of articles and sketches submitted in our Soldiers' Prose competition. These are paid for at our regular rates and there is also a special prize for the best entry submitted during each calendar month. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the Major never said a word until he'd come to the fourth locker. Then, he said, "I hope these tacks don't come from our bulletin board." He grinned slyly at the recruits, but kept his face hidden from the Lieutenant.

He came up to Al Figueira's locker just after he'd found some dust in a hidden corner of Pfc. Allen's shelf. The Lieutenant held his breath as the Major bent over Figueira's locker.

Pvt. Figueira was the first to have no photos or pin-ups on his locker-top, but in their place was a neatly typed little paper. The Major bent closer to read this. He read: "Man's dearest possession is life, and since it is given to him to live but once, he must so live as not to be seared with the shame of a cowardly and trivial past, so live as not to be tortured for years without purpose, so live that dying he can say: 'All my life and my strength were given to the first cause in the world—the liberation of mankind.' VIL."

"Very good," he thought. Then, "Very good," he said as he straightened up. "What's 'VIL'?" he wondered, "a Psalm number or something?" He looked at Private Figueira and then grinned when he saw the boy blushing.

The Major had an open, intelligent face and when he grinned it usually relaxed anyone looking at him—but the Lieutenant noticed, now, that Figueira's fluster only increased. The Major hadn't noticed this. He was thinking and having a very pleasant thought. "Make a copy of that for me, will you?" he said to Figueira. "Want to use it on the masthead of the new battalion paper."

"Yes . . . Yes, sir!" Figueira stammered. He nodded.

"Spent three hours last night looking for a good quote," the Major said to the Lieutenant as he turned with him. "And now it pops right up at me."

"Yes, sir," the Lieutenant said.

That afternoon, Figueira hung around his company orderly room for a solid half-hour—without going in. He held a neatly typed copy of the piece in his hand, but he was afraid to go in and tell the First Sergeant a certain fact that he knew he must tell him.

The other men of the company passed him going in and then coming out with their week-end passes, but he only stood about smoking and ducking so as not to talk to anyone. Finally, he walked in and went up to the First Sergeant's desk. He held his overseas cap in his hand.

The Sergeant saw the paper. "Haven't you taken it over yet?"

"I wanted to ask . . ." Figueira began.

"The Major's waiting—he's got to quit at three. So you'd better go over. Go on over," the Sergeant said.

"But, Sergeant, I don't think the Major will like. . . . He doesn't know who it's by."

"What the hell difference does that make?" the Sergeant said. He was staring up at Figueira. "He likes the quote and he wants it for the paper. That's all! Take it over," he said.

Figueira said, "Yes, Sergeant." He shook his head slowly and went out. The Sergeant stared after him.

The Major was in his office at Battalion Headquarters when Figueira walked in. Figueira looked in through the doorway and then, when the Major nodded, he walked up to his desk, snapped to attention, and saluted. "Private Figueira reporting, Sir, as requested." He held out the paper.

"Yes," the Major said. "Thanks very much, Private!" He took the paper eagerly and glanced down at it for a moment.

"Who's it by?" he said. Then, "At ease!" he said when he noticed the boy still standing at attention. "Paine? It sounds like good Paine—or Jefferson?" The Major was looking up at him.

"It's by . . . It's by Lenin, sir," Figueira said, blushing deeply.

"Oh." The Major pursed his lips and stayed looking at Figueira. Then he bent his head slowly to the paper and read it very carefully. He seemed to take it word for word. "It's still damned good," he said, still looking down. "Very damned good."

"It was pointed out to me, sir. A friend of mine copied it out for me," Figueira said. This was true. In all his reading of Lenin, he had never come across this particular passage.

"Well, that's neither here nor there," the Major said. "No . . ." He was looking away from Figueira and out the window. "I'd still like to use it though," he said. "But you understand." He turned to look up at Figueira. He still held the paper tightly between his fingers.

"Yes, sir," Figueira said. "Yes, sir. I understand, sir."

The Major stared at the paper for another long moment. Then, he looked up suddenly. "I'll think of something," he said definitely. "I'll think of something." He nodded to Figueira to dismiss him, and then returned his salute.

If I make it Paine, the Major sat thinking, there's someone sure to look it up. He'd seen some copies of Paine at the officers' club, and in the service libraries. And with Jefferson, it would be worse—the men down here knew quite a lot of Jefferson. He was certain some of them knew every damned word he'd written. Lincoln was out, too, in this part of the country.

He stared at the paper as he thought, and then read it over again. Suddenly, he reached for his fountain pen and took it, and neatly inked out the VIL. Then, just above that and under the quotation, he printed, in a bold, firm hand: MAJOR THOMAS L. KERR, his own name.

PFC. PRUDENCIO DE PEREDA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Mostly Politics

FOR THE THIRD TIME in history America is preparing to hold a presidential election in the midst of a bloody war. Madison was reëlected in 1812; Lincoln in 1864; and Roosevelt—?

The Democratic National Committee meets here this week to ratify Chicago as their convention city, and to accept the resignation of Chairman Frank Walker. Republicans met in Chicago similarly last week.

The big thing at the Republican conference was that the Dewey team, Jaeckle and Sprague (Edwin F. Jaeckle and J. Russel Sprague) intimated that Dewey is willing. So that's that. They didn't say so in so many words, but they left that impression with every committee member who called at their suite, No. 1600 Stevens Hotel. Every correspondent and nearly every committeeman at Chicago came away with the feeling that Dewey is the leading Republican contender.

Willkie has slipped in the past four months. Although the battle is still a Willkie-Dewey one, the former now must make a big popular showing in the thirteen states that have preferential primaries, to maintain his prestige. Mr. Pew's buddy, John Hamilton, who answered Vermont Governor Wills's pro-Willkie speech on the radio Sunday, dared Willkie to go out into the primaries and show what he could do, and Willkie will accept the challenge. He has a good chance of capturing the New Hampshire delegates, who are the first to come up in open primaries, and he will enter his name in the contested Wisconsin primary battle and also probably in Nebraska, where a Stassen slate has been entered. The result of these battles may decide Willkie's political future.

About the only other item at Chicago was the comic relief of egregious Harrison Spangler, who made one boner after another, from his "any Republican can win" comment, to his bumbling announcement about a "survey" of soldier political opinion, and his ejaculation to a newsman when told that a rump conference of 50 national committeemen was meeting to deplore his "dictatorial" tactics: "I know who these men are; they are just a little bunch of saboteurs trying to wreck the party's unity."

Every time Mr. Spangler opens his mouth his foot is already in it.

Is Spangler important? Yes, because the things he is stupid enough to say are the things the true-blue Republican Old Guard are thinking. And any Republican presidential candidate who won in a landslide, Willkie or Dewey, would sweep the Old Guard straight back into office again, Grundy tariffs and all.

Now let us take a look at Mr. Roosevelt. If he is campaigning he is making the queerest campaign in history. His strongest political support came from labor, and Mr. Roosevelt has just antagonized the powerful rail brotherhoods by seizing the railroads, and all labor by his national-service proposal. Most politicians wouldn't touch taxes before an election with a ten-foot pole; Mr. Roosevelt has told the public brutally that it isn't paying taxes enough. The odd thing is that a lot of hard-boiled observers are now wondering if they didn't count Mr. Roosevelt out too soon.

For the time cries for boldness, and Mr. Roosevelt's new line is one of bold aggression. He is saying "politics be damned," which is often the best kind of politics. He is pinning responsibility on Congress in a dozen matters. While Republican contenders are cautiously steering away from domestic issues, Roosevelt has moved in. His chief political handicap was the taunt that he was over-sympathetic to labor, and whether he thought about the political implications or not, the effect of his recent strong action is to lift his candidacy out of the narrow groove of class support to a broader national level.

What is my personal view? To be frank I am not even quite sure Mr. Roosevelt will run. If you ask me what I think animates Mr. Roosevelt, I think it is a sense of history. In these recent drastic proposals I think he is setting his historical record straight. He made a mistake three years ago (he feels) in not asking for national service; now he is trying to fill the gap. In addition to that, but secondary to it, I believe, Mr. Roosevelt is a very shrewd politician. He has done nothing to close the way to his fourth-term candidacy; has done everything to keep the path free. I think he is perfectly aware of the political benefits of boldness at the present time. But he is still weighing chances—and time is getting short.

To every Roosevelt appeal for more taxes, the "sound-money" New York Times, which ought to be leading the higher-tax fight beside the President, has hopelessly croaked "sales tax," and then run out on the battle. At the risk of repetition, the anti-sales-tax argument deserves to be put down. The first point against the Times sales tax is that it won't raise the money. Why? For this reason: The proposal is for a general 10-percent sales tax. It would yield about $6,000,000,000 if applied universally. But nobody wants to apply it universally, least of all Congress. Its advocates would exempt the "necessities of life."

The result is that the 10-percent sales tax, with these exemptions, according to Treasury estimates, would raise only $2,600,000,000. Further, excise taxes are already levied on a lot of goods that would be included under a sales tax. To avoid duplication another $1,200,000,000 would have to be dropped. *Final revenue*: $1,400,000,000.

I have not gone into social arguments at all. Most of us would recoil at taxing big families to the benefit of small ones, which is what a sales tax means. But the real point is that there is no political possibility, I believe, of getting through Congress a sales tax that would meet the fiscal need. Recognizing this, the Treasury has urged specific excise taxes on nonessentials rather than general over-all sales taxes. It proposed special imposts to raise $2,500,000,000. But instead of that, the House cut these special excises to $1,200,000,000. Advocates of a general sales tax like The Times must face these facts. The Treasury proposal, which it repeatedly derides, would raise more in excise taxes than what the House is prepared to approve. Then what chance has a sales tax?

Washington. T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among the Missing: Hitchcock

"Lifeboat," the new Alfred Hitchcock movie, is a kind of ersatz film that both irritates and holds you effortlessly to its exposition for more than two hours, though it hardly ever moves outside the radius of a rather large-sized lifeboat. The film enacts the story of ten people in this boat, somewhere off Bermuda, nine of whom are survivors from an American freighter sunk by a U-boat, and the tenth is a Nazi from the submarine which the freighter sank just before going down. The film's design is to show how this Nazi (beautifully played by Walter Slezak), by taking advantage of the others' humanity, sense of fair play, divided aims and general physical and mental debility, gains control of their boat, their minds and bodies and stabs them all in the back. This intended parallel to the way the Nazis came into power leaves a number of points in doubt, proves itself by some rather flat-footed dénouements and is never essentially convincing. It is an intellectual preconception that never seems to come out of the natures of the people involved, but happens like a shotgun wedding. This inevitability is no doubt just what the authors wanted, but it is their inevitability, not the film's or its people's; one of its failures is that you get no idea of what passes in men's minds and in their relationships during an event that is one of the most strikingly odd, awesome and important occasions of this time. You will come out of this movie knowing no more of what it is like in a lifeboat with a few people in mid-ocean than you did when you went in.

Hitchcock and the two authors (John Steinbeck wrote the original and Jo Swerling did the screen adaptation) have performed a major-league trick of entertainment and concision in keeping you comfortably and completely interested in their story, though it is solid talk in rather close quarters. They have jolted the voyage from one bewildering event to another (each event made compulsively ironical), left out all transitions or passive moments, achieved a certain realism on a theatrical level and rightly concentrated on the arresting looks of the cast. It is a strange voyage: no one is silent or discomforted, or hungry, or cold, or afraid, nor are you supposed to feel much of that. The events pile up ineffectually one on the other; they give you no intimation of the characters' personalities; there is a great deal of old scenario baggage in the boat, yet the picture never lets go of you.

The cast is the most invigorating one to look at—person for person—that I have seen in years, and it is a capable one directed by a man who seldom leaves any bad acting on the line. Personally, I could only marvel at William Bendix's capacity for following the director's orders to the letter (his drunk scene is the best thing in the picture), have nothing but praise for Hull, whose jovial capitalist is beyond my analysis, like Hume Cronyn best, Bankhead least, and feel that Mary Anderson is a twin of Teresa Wright's and a good one.

But this film contains less of the original Hitchcock quality, before it got caught in the Hollywood assembly line four years ago, than any of the American films Hitchcock has made since. He still exercises a good hand with his players, though the acting here is much broader, more theatrical and showy than anything he made use of before, and his sense of pace still operates: these two talents make the picture as much as the melodrama, the flashy dialogue or the actors themselves. There is no longer the intent or the need on his part to make his material, no matter how romantic it is, seem perfectly real and natural in appearance—the quality that made his English films light but rewarding experiences of the manners, classes of people, architecture and prejudices of our time.

He indicates this naturalism in the very opening scene of "Lifeboat"—but never again after that—when he realizes the whole emotional effect of the freighter's sinking by concentrating solely on the movement of the smokestack as it passes into and out of sight under the water. Then he makes a characteristic, sardonic visual comment on the fact by passing some of the freighter's wreckage in the water before your eyes: a crate of oranges, a copy of The New Yorker, some currency, a deck of cards slowly fanning out, and a Nazi's dead body. It is the satirically edged naturalism of an intelligent, highly inquisitive creative talent from which emotion is largely lacking, which uses nothing but the means of the cinema to tell its story and has an exact eye and ear with which to do it. Everything else in this movie is theatrical or posed—when a person or group sits in the boat you feel instinctively that they were arranged there a moment before and aren't going to do anything that isn't in the script. The lifeboat gives less the illusion of a lifeboat, for all its pitching and tossing, than of an expansive, well protected stage, and the actors, in spite of their caked mouths and peeled, sunburned skin, seem the best fed, most rested and secure actors in the war movies. It is this lack of belief in or concern for the actual event in the picture that makes you most distrustful of what it tells you.

Hitchcock's working vocabulary—before the death-dealing pressure in Hollywood hit him—was one of the most natural and complete that I know of in contemporary movie-making; but that vocabulary dwindles more and more as the number of his films increases. There is no indication in "Lifeboat" of his talent for getting the most startling effects with sound, nor of his use of screen silence to build the highest tension into a moment. But sometimes here, as in the playing of Hume Cronyn, he realizes that peculiar Hitchcock manner with the player, in which the actor seems to be concentrating mentally on what he is about to do but never quite does it; so that his pantomime takes on a kind of sinister spontaneity. At one point where Alice (Mary Anderson) is telling Mrs. Porter (Tallulah Bankhead) of her fear of becoming an adulteress, the crossed feet, which belong to the man sitting above her, and which stick into the top of the scene, suddenly fall apart, making one of those typical symbolic allusions that were always possible in Hitchcock's early films. At another point, in the siesta of the young lovers, the man repeats an action that has occurred before—undoing the ribbon around the girl's hair—and she asks, perplexed and somewhat irritated, "Stanley, why must you do that?" It is the highly surprising and spontaneous statement that was also more likely than not in the early films.

I hope that "Lifeboat" is only an aberration and not the solidifying of a destructive trend in Hitchcock's work, and also, if it is a result of pressure, which seems likely, someone will have the sense to remove same.

MANNY FARBER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

I have never said that the unions need more democracy. I dislike the word because this country is a republic and it occurs nowhere in either the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence. – *Westbrook Pegler in The New York World-Telegram.*

MANY ATROCITIES LISTED BY CHINESE
Barbarity of Japanese Held to Be Psychopathic
Compensation for Lack of Charm
– *Head and subhead in The New York Times.*

The judgment of Washington about the labor situation, indeed about the home front as a whole, has an air of hopelessness. Such words as "chaos" and "anarchy" are used—but they are used as words of cool, technical description rather than as angry epithets. – *Mark Sullivan in The New York Herald Tribune.*

Growing number of influenza cases in the United States won't have the same beneficial influence on earnings of drug companies this year and in 1944 as similar waves of bad health have had in the past. The excess-profits tax has cut [so] deeply into the expanding profits of leading companies that only a small part of the gross income obtained through larger sales can be carried down to net profit. – *From Barron's magazine.*

Note to Appeasers

The new Spanish budget . . . provides 475,000,000 pesetas (about $47,500,000) for the Falange [Spain's equivalent of the Nazi Party] in contrast to 154,000,000 pesetas (about $15,000,000) provided last year. . . . The amount for Spain's Ministry of Education was cut from 559,000,000 pesetas last year to 166,000,000 this year. – *From PM.*

The Redcoats Are Coming

You may have forgotten the tremendous tension that arose between Great Britain and this country over our naval building plans before the treaty limiting our navy was adopted. . . . At that time the tension was so great that our general staff feared an army of 300,000 regulars, then in England, would be landed in Canada and marched against this country, which had completely demobilized.

The idea appears fantastic, but it did not appear fantastic to our general staff at that time. I know, because I worked with the general staff on plans of defense—for the defense of Detroit.

As long as our foreign policy was realistic and patriotic, it was enormously successful. – *Colonel McCormick in The Chicago Daily Tribune.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Labor and the Community

SIR: In your editorial articles of June 21, November 8, November 15 and November 22, and also in George Soule's and Helen Fuller's articles in your issues of July 5 and November 15 respectively, it is clearly implied or directly stated that "labor," by "forgoing wage increases," is the only group in the country that is "doing any serious sacrificing," and that the wages of the "workers" are prevented by governmental action from rising "above a certain arbitrary formula," while farmers and business men, being virtually uncontrolled, are left free to make very large profits.

The facts are that "labor" appears to have made relatively greater profits out of the war than either farmers or business men. Total factory pay rolls have tripled since 1939. While this increase has been accompanied by a rise in the number of employees, a very large portion of the latter must have been drawn from the families of persons already employed, so that the advance in the total average income of such families must have been not very far short of 200 percent. Nor is there any indication that this growth of income has been effectively checked by the application of the Little Steel formula. This is no doubt due to the recent increase in working hours, with excess pay for Sunday labor and for hours above 40 per week

In your editorial article of November 8 you imply that miners' wages had not advanced sufficiently to compensate them for the increase in the cost of living. As a matter of fact, while this latter increase has been about 25 percent, bituminous miners' monthly per-capita earnings had advanced almost 80 percent from 1939 to April, 1943, and since the latter date, as a result of recent gains, the increase is of course much greater.

Finally, there is implicit in your articles an extraordinary theory of "labor" as a superior class—superior to all others in respect to self-restraint, willingness to sacrifice, patriotism and "deep devotion to the purposes of this war." Even more questionable than this theory is the deduction you appear to draw from it, namely, that there are and should be no laws touching labor's supposed rights—especially the right to strike—which labor is or should be bound to respect.

The College of Emporia, Emporia, Kan. F. R. FLOURNOY

[The New Republic is not a labor paper. We are interested in the American community as a whole, and we seek a reasonable balance among its component parts. However, Professor Flournoy's statistics seem to us dubious, and he certainly leaves out some important facts. Figures of the Department of Commerce and the Office of Price Administration, analyzed by Donald Montgomery, show that, per person, the farmer's net income is up 198 percent over 1939. Salaries and wages as a whole, per person, before taxes, are up 61 percent. The corresponding figures for salaries and wages in manufacturing, trade and mining are 86, 33 and 47 percent respectively. Corporation profits before taxes are up 341 percent; after taxes, 110 percent.

In numerous articles, The New Republic has drawn attention to the fact that the total earnings of labor have greatly increased, and has endeavored to take account of that fact in everything we have written. It is nevertheless a significant fact that this increase is derived largely from greater employment, greater output and longer hours of work rather than from an increase of wage scales. If farmers and their spokesmen had been content with the great gains made from larger production and harder work, rather than insisting on price increases as well, there would be far less demand than there is today for wage increases on the part of labor. It was the farm bloc in Congress, and not labor, which took the aggressive in increases of the basic unit of measurement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor can logically argue that it is just as much entitled to the earnings derived from a larger volume of work as business and agriculture are entitled to the profits of larger volume. If either business or agriculture charges higher prices in addition, higher hourly wages are also justifiable. This attitude is supported by the fact that the increased earnings are far from being shared equitably by workers. Some industries have not felt the stimulus of war conditions. And while some family earnings have been increased by full employment, there are millions of other cases where individuals alone are concerned, or where relatives cannot make up for the loss of breadwinners who have joined the armed forces.

The only fair anti-inflationary measure with which to deal with all these inequalities is stiff, progressive income taxation with a low exemption. There is no justice in permitting prices to rise while forbidding increases in wage rates, nor is this a practicable or effective anti-inflationary measure.

The right to strike of course should not be exercised, and has in fact been relinquished, by the great bulk of labor for the duration of the war. Nevertheless if men have not fundamentally the right to refuse to sell their labor at the terms offered, we have, in substance, a system of slavery. – THE EDITORS]

My Choice for President

[The letters published below were written in response to an inquiry from The New Republic asking each author what individual would be his personal choice for President. Other groups will appear in subsequent issues. – THE EDITORS]

SIR: I march with the "We Want Willkie" banner, and that's my slogan. It seems to me that Willkie and his international viewpoint are vital to the Republican Party at this time, if our party is to live through this terrible crisis.

Emporia, Kan. W. A. WHITE

SIR: The choice of a President for the term commencing in 1945 is certainly one of the most momentous that has faced the American people in its whole history. Two or three unquestionable principles may serve as a preliminary guide. In the first place, the choice should be made completely without reference to the political affiliations of the candidate. There is not enough difference in the fundamental tenets authoritatively presented by the two parties to afford any real preference. In the second place, the international problems are so complex and acute that it will be exceedingly difficult for a new man, however competent, to step in and handle affairs as efficiently as one who has had his hand on the throttle for years past. Third, it must be recognized that the problems that follow the signing of the peace will be at least as difficult as those of the war period.

It follows that the choice for President must in the end depend upon what happens in the international situation before the election takes place. If it could be imagined that the war would be over and a satisfactory peace organization established, then I should be inclined to give Mr. Roosevelt a much earned rest, and pick the best available man. Of all the possibilities now looming on the horizon I think my first choice would be Henry A. Wallace. He has the vision, the breadth of outlook and the sympathetic comprehension of the coming era better than any man I know. I would trust him to display all the administrative capacity needed.

If I thought that Mr. Willkie could really be himself, and could follow the liberal ideas which I am sure he sincerely holds, without being bound by commitments to any set of backers, and without truckling to any political elements that might have helped to elect him, I should expect him to do a very good job. But as things stand now, this is a "supposition contrary to the facts."

I know of no other individual who has the slightest chance of being elected who has given any evidence of possessing the qualities necessary for this high office.

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

New York University, New York City

SIR: The next President will have to meet demands such as no other man has ever had to face. Under him America must take the lead in finishing the war, feeding and restoring the war-torn nations, and keeping open their roads to democracy. And he must guide the nations in winning the peace.

He must also plan the readjustment of our country, and defeat the formidable plan of concentrated wealth to dominate our government and our people.

In order to accomplish these gigantic tasks, without example in history, the next President should have, first, full knowledge of the war, for as Commander-in-Chief his word will be final.

He should also have worldwide knowledge of foreign nations, their objectives and their leaders, for to win the peace he must lead the world.

He should know our people—how they live, what they need and how they think. He should understand political pressures and be aware of what makes politics tick. And he should know Congress like the back of his hand.

He should be able to reduce expenses and increase efficiency by creating sound organization and high morale. Especially he should have character and executive punch.

Such a man would be my ideal candidate. Where you will find him I do not know. So far, with me, Roosevelt and Willkie stand first.

Washington, D. C. GIFFORD PINCHOT

Eric Johnston as Candidate

SIR: The suggestion in the article by George Soule [The New Republic, December 13] that Mr. Eric Johnston may be a candidate in the next presidential election is so disquieting that it seems a bounden duty to point out that in Mr. Soule's very appreciative sketch of Mr. Johnston the name of the Herbert Hoover of 1928 might be substituted without materially disturbing its verity or application. Except for some difference in age, a greater capacity for mixing and a certain disarming quality that enabled Mr. Johnston to ride off with the bride like a Lochinvar, though "he weapons had none," there is no essential difference between the two men. In fact they are so alike in their history, training and viewpoints that it is sheer heedless folly to suppose that an administration by Mr. Johnston would be followed by results substantially different from those that followed the election of Mr. Hoover, and that we would not again shortly find ourselves with a huge and amazingly efficient productive equipment standing idle, while skilled and willing workers attempted to make a living by peddling apples and similar rugged pursuits.

The reason is basic and simple. Mr. Johnston, even more than Mr. Hoover, is possessed by an instinctive feeling that man must live to produce, rather than produce to live. (To be absolutely fair, it should be noted that promoters like Mr. Hoover and Mr. Johnston go on the assumption that, given unlimited production, well being and plenty for everybody must follow. But that assumption has been repeatedly proved false by periodic depressions for which no one has as yet found any credible reason except that in each instance production outstripped consumption and the system became clogged with goods that could not be moved.) As long as men with their predominantly promotional vision dominate in our economic councils, we shall always have too much—and never enough to go around. Except, of course, during the intervals of devastating war.

Holicong, Pa. BENJAMIN KIRSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Newsreels

SIR: Each week I look forward to Manny Farber's movie articles, but today I must take issue on his Newsreel piece [November 22]. (Until recently I was the British government fillm officer here and before that I was associated with a chain of theatres in England.)

1. I entirely agree with his main criticism of the newsreels: they are conventional. Now the newsreel people themselves know this too; but they are powerless to change their policy because

(a) They are under the thumb of the "home office," *i. e.*, the controlling interest (MGM over "News of the Day," etc.).

(b) They are more or less pledged, through the Hays Office and other agencies, to remain an *impartial* commentary on current events (remember the congressional investigation two years ago?).

(c) Moviegoers expect—or are said to expect—the reels to be enthusiastic and happy about everything. And they have to be sold, along with other products, to the theatres.

2. The speed of production is an important factor. I agree; but it should not prevent individuality. I agree that a once-weekly reel would be preferable; but probably the cost of making up and sending out "specials" to cover spot-news items of importance would not be worth while. The reels are still highly competitive in this way, and they are made to sell alongside thousands of "three-day" feature bookings.

3. In Britain, at least one newsreel—Paramount—has devoted whole editions to one controversial topic. There is much more freedom in this respect in the five British newsreels.

4. In suggesting that newsreels should concentrate on presenting a digest, I would suggest you see a few Paramount (U. S.) reels: they have made a real attempt sometimes to present an "editorialized" treatment, not without success. I agree that the other four companies don't do anything of the kind.

5. I don't think that you can drag in "Desert Victory" to prove your point. "D. V." was *in toto* a studio production that took quite a long time to put together and required considerable technical facilities and skilled personnel, apart from cutters and editors. Have you ever seen a newsreel make-up, between deadline for material and shipment of first prints? It's an object lesson in what can be done in three or four hours.

6. Cameramen—you hit the nail on the head. By and large, newsreel cameramen are unimaginative. Why? Because the unions have consistently opposed the entry of younger men. You might do something to expose this angle.

7. "There is nothing candid about this camera." Agreed. But have you ever been with the newsreel boys when they have to cover an important man, getting off a plane or a ship? Usually there is a fight to keep the still-cameramen away, and the newspapermen are horning in, and the man wants to get away, and you have to set your mikes up somewhere and bring the man to the mikes. You are right about the Axis newsreels—they certainly cover their personalities. But their personalities often take their own cameramen along everywhere as part of their entourage. I think that, in a year or two, the release of hundreds of young, trained cameramen from the armed services should make a lot of difference to the newsreels.

Washington, D. C. RICHARD R. FORD

SIR: Mr. Ford's illumination of the set-up in newsreel making is to my mind a beauty. I disagree with him that this illumination of the set-up differs appreciably from my idea of what results from that set-up. I wish to say, concerning point 1 (b), that I do not consider "impartial" commentary that which is only the most pleasant, least important aspect of the superficial parts of certain events. Nor do I think that anything that is pledged to the Hays Office (or any other agency) impartial, by a long sight. About 1 (c), I don't believe the expectancy of moviegoers for the enthusiastic and happy is a cause of newsreel conventionalism and superficiality; I think it is a result —if there is such an expectancy, which is highly arguable. The idea that people have to be "sold to the theatres" is Hollywood's, not the people's, and the cheapest defense of a product's having to be cheap. If I gave the impression that the speed-up destroys all individuality, I am sorry—it was only meant as an explanation of newsreel spottiness. I think (about point 2) that any improvement that can be made in the newsreel by sending out "specials" is worth-while, no matter how expensive, because the newsreels can be that important. I doubt that a good coverage of an important event will be outsold by a minute coverage of that event, no matter how late it hits the market. I don't believe Paramount is enough better to be different from my general conclusions about the other companies, but I appreciate and am thankful that it is better. I do think I can drag in "Desert Victory" simply because no matter how long it took to prepare and how costly and how late it was in appearing (I think Mr. Ford gives a false impression that "Desert Victory" was filmed as a studio production), it was better than anything else that was presented on this event by the newsreel people. Mr. Ford's description of what the newsreel people have to buck is exceedingly important, and I am grateful for it; I feel it a failure in my story not to have brought this in.

New York City MANNY FARBER

"East of Farewell"

SIR: I would like to add, as the best, or one of the best novels about the war to date, in place of the enormously overrated "Signed with Their Honor," Howard Hunt's "East of Farewell." So far as I am aware, Margaret Marshall and Diana Trilling were the only two reviewers who even noticed it. Compared with it, "Signed with Their Honor" was mere imitation Hemingway and not too good at that.

Mr. Hunt's novel struck me as having something that would outlast the season, but it did not seem to get anywhere. Its merits were quite independent of the fact that America was at war. It was a psychologic study of men at sea in a ship. This is flatly against the American tradition. According to that tradition in our writing, as soon as a man ships for a voyage he becomes the complete extrovert, with nothing inside him. . . .

Brookfield, Conn. WILLIAM MCFEE

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Henry W. Harris, of Boston, writes belatedly to say that he feels we were unfair to Senator Walsh of Massachusetts in our special supplement "Reaction in Congress" [The New Republic, August 2, 1943]. We recorded Senator Walsh as voting against the administration on the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill, but in favor of the administration on overridding the President's veto. Mr. Harris says he believes Senator Walsh voted against the conference report on the Smith-Connally bill and that he was one of a group of men who assailed the conference report. The New Republic's records indicate that the Senator voted for the Connally bill but against the Smith-Connally conference report. We recorded the former vote for all the Senators, since it seemed to us a more concrete expression of their positions than the second vote on the involved and ambiguous conference report. Technically speaking, we should not have labeled the vote which we recorded as one on the Smith-Connally "bill."

The League for Mutual Aid announces that Professor Gaetano Salvemini will be the guest speaker at its twenty-fourth anniversary dinner, to be held at the Aldine Club on January 29, in New York City. Professor Salvemini will speak on "America at the Crossroads in Italy."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Europe in Exile

THIS BIG ANTHOLOGY[1] is valuable in spite of its faults, which nobody could fail to mention. Some of them are the inevitable results of trying to cover the whole field of European letters at a moment when only the Swiss and the Swedish writers can work in relative freedom (and even these have found that neutrality is a prison for the mind). The Portuguese are oppressed only by their own dictator; but in every other country west of the Russian border, the writers are dead, or are living in fear of imprisonment, or else they are scattered in exile. It is true that New York has become a second capital for European literature—with Mexico City as its largest suburb—but that is not wholly an advantage for editors working here, since they are likely to become involved in the quarrels of literary groups. If Schmidt is included in their book, then Braun must be left out of it—and what about Müller, who doesn't write very well, but still he's a capital fellow, with the right opinions? What about those very few distinguished writers who have gone over to the Nazis? The editors had their greatest moral struggle over Knut Hamsun, and I think they were right to omit him, considering that any other course would have outraged the Norwegian patriots. Still, his place is not quite filled by Bishop Berggrav, who is a heroic Christian but a very modest man of letters.

The German section of the anthology is the longest, with 131 pages, and it should also be the best, considering that both the editors are German exiles; but it has suffered more than the others from what appear to be political limitations. It omits all authors now living in the Reich—not only the Nazis, whom nobody will miss, but also men like Fallada and Jünger, who have written allegorical novels against them. Among the exiles, it omits the journalists, the anti-war novelists like Arnold Zweig and, in addition, almost everybody suspected of fondness for Moscow; there is nothing here by Johannes R. Becher, Anna Seghers, Oscar Maria Graf or Lion Feuchtwanger, not to mention a dozen others. The result is an incomplete and not very flattering picture of German letters.

The French section, of 124 pages, sets out to be more representative. It includes almost all of the standard names —even those of Henry de Montherlant and Jean Cocteau, who have been collaborating with the Nazis—but it is not very wise in its choice of texts. Almost anything else from Gide would have been better than his rhapsody "On Joy and Progress," which has a foolish sound when translated into English. Proust's famous passage on the death of Bergotte has been absurdly overrated and overworked by anthologists.

The Russian section has 91 pages, making it the third in length. More than half of it consists of two long stories: "The Hermit," by Maxim Gorky, which is superb, and "Natalie," by Ivan Bunin, which is an echo from the past, a bundle of Grandmother's love letters smelling of violet sachet powder. The section as a whole shows no great familiarity with Russian literature since the revolution and several brilliant Soviet writers are missing—Leonov, Petrov and Fadayev, to mention only three.

Some of the shorter national sections are more interesting than any of those devoted to the big countries. Austria (69 pages) is represented chiefly by older men, but they are all sound craftsmen. Czecho-Slovakia (63 pages), Belgium (44 pages) and the Netherlands (44 pages) each contributes writers of distinction. I should call attention to Egon Hostovsky, Gerard Walschap (who writes in Flemish), Simon Vestdijk and Adriaan van der Veen, all of whom are practically unknown in this country. The Polish section of 24 pages is notable for a patriotic poem by Juljan Tuwim, simple, moving and admirably translated by Joy Davidman. One gets the impression that European literature, starting from Paris as a center, has spread over the continent like ripples over a pool. During this process of cultural diffusion, it has flourished at the circumference—that is, among comparatively new nations and cultures—while the center has lost some of its vigor and its animal faith.

There are twenty-one countries represented in the anthology—all those existing in pre-war Europe except Luxemburg, Albania and the three Baltic states. These are not very serious oversights, but I miss several of the minority literatures, especially Ukrainian and Catalan. There are 157 authors, including those who wrote the introductions to the various national sections: three of these are Americans, but most of the others were born in the countries they describe. The introductions differ widely in quality; the best are those dealing with Belgium, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland and Portugal. Some of the others are valuable chiefly as lists of names, but Karin Michaëlis goes to the other extreme in her entertaining essay on Denmark; the only two writers she mentions are Herman Bang and Henrik Pontoppidan, two men whose work is omitted from the Danish section. Demetrios Capetanakis writes about Greek literature without mentioning any names at all.

In spite of the inconsistencies, which might have been prevented by stricter editing, the book gives a remarkably vivid picture of European literature between the two wars. We see the same literary movements appearing simultaneously in almost all countries. First came the experiments in form (like cubism and constructivism), then the experiments with fantastic images from the subconscious mind (known generally as surrealism) and then experiments in proletarian writing, ending in Russia with socialist realism. Not one of these movements was a break with the past. Each was implicit in the work Flaubert or Baudelaire or Tolstoy.

But there was something new in the literature of twentieth-century Europe: a sense of fear and a sense of guilt. Says Jan Greshoff, writing about the Dutch poets, "The war of 1939 did not come unexpectedly. The entire period

[1] Heart of Europe: An Anthology of Creative Writing in Europe, 1920-1940, edited by Klaus Mann and Hermann Kesten. New York: L. B. Fischer. 1,006 pages. $5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between 1918 and 1938, twenty long years, is dominated and characterized by fear of the inevitable." As for the sense of guilt, it is expressed most clearly in "Vertigo," a story by Egon Hostovsky that is perhaps the most brilliant in the whole volume. It deals in part with an Austrian exile, half-crazed by misfortune, who believes that his own sins are somehow responsible for the fate of Europe. He cries, "The world is tottering, the world is collapsing, and I know that I am a fellow accomplice." That illogical but powerful emotion broods in the hearts of many European writers.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Education After the War

Liberal Education Reëxamined: Its Role in a Democracy, by Theodore M. Greene and Others. New York: Harper and Brothers. 134 pages. $2.

THE UNPRECEDENTED NUMBER of recent books by educators suggests that they are like sports writers in the winter. When there aren't any ballplayers, they have to go on talking anyway, and to conjecture the prospects for the next season. The literary one, the John Kieran among them, is, of course, Mark Van Doren, though the smartest mind, the Ring Lardner master of the fastest pace, is still President Hutchins of Chicago. But since, fortunately, I have no full-blown Pegler to produce, I had better drop the analogy.

The book edited by Professor Greene of Princeton, under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies, is more in the nature of a report to the faculty. Neither so sensitive as Van Doren, nor so bold as Hutchins, Greene and his colleagues present a sober traditionalist view. As in all discussions today, their keyword is "freedom," so it is important to see in what kind of context they put it. When President Wriston of Brown announces in the opening chapter that "By men devoted to the American tradition of individualism, the lack of centralized control is described as 'wisdom'," we suspect that we may be going to get a whiff of Pegler or Bill Cunningham after all. And in President Wriston's successive assumptions it becomes apparent that his "freedom," like that of most university trustees and corporations, is whatever the New Deal wasn't.

Professor Greene keeps the bulk of the discussion out of a specific political context altogether. He argues carefully for the double value to the student of the contrasting disciplines of art and science, and puts his stress on history and philosophy as the chief means of integration—though again it must be granted that Van Doren can carry on a similar argument on a much more resilient and imaginative level. Greene's own values come out in many passages, as when he says that "freedom has significance for us only when conceived as the freedom of individuals." Although he qualifies with a few remarks about the individual's "obligations," he seems to think primarily in terms of nineteenth-century individualism and hardly to conceive of a less egocentric, less centrifugal order wherein the individual finds his fulfilment only through his matured interrelations with society. In all such matters Alexander Meiklejohn showed a much firmer grasp in his "Education Between Two Worlds," since he recognized that our American individ-

RACE RIOTS OR RACE UNITY

which shall it be, America?

We must face the facts—the facts that prove the insincerity of our democratic claims of equality. This series of books mirrors the shortcomings in our relations with the Negro—shows why it has happened, and how we can proceed to practice the democracy we profess.

An American Dilemma

THE NEGRO PROBLEM and AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

By GUNNAR MYRDAL

Prof. of Social Economy, University of Stockholm

An over-all study of the entire Carnegie study of the American Negro. "Exhaustive and objective . . . a real contribution. Recommended to all who take their 'American creed' seriously."—*Library Journal. Just published!* 2 vols., $7.50

The Negro's Share

By RICHARD STERNER

Noted Swedish Social Scientist

Job opportunities, housing facilities, public assistance made available to the Negro—reinforced by numerous tables to offer a shocking revelation. "Complete, authoritative and up-to-date information on the living standards of the American Negro."—*Book-of-the-Month Club News.* $4.50

Patterns of Negro Segregation

By CHARLES S. JOHNSON

Dean of Social Science, Fiske University

The disturbing facts about discrimination against the Negro in the armed forces, in industry, the professions, business, education, etc. "Scholarly and alive."—*Survey Graphic.* "Objective and comprehensive."—*New Republic.* $3.50

Myth of the Negro Past

By MELVILLE J. HERSKOVITS, Ph.D.

Prof. of Anthropology, Northwestern University

Overwhelming scientific evidence is here presented to refute widely accepted beliefs concerning Negro inferiority, a myth due chiefly to failure to appreciate the past of Negro civilization in its true light. "Absorbing and significant."—*New York Times.* $4.00

Coming February 16th

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO

Edited by Otto Klineberg. An evaluation of Negro intelligence, anthropometric measurements, and other aspects of psychological differences. $4.00

Note: The Negro in American Life Series is sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation

Order these books from your bookseller or direct from

HARPER & BROTHERS · 49 E. 33rd St. · New York 16

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ualism has been "far too simple," that the state and the individual are not enemies, that in our vast modern society only a strong state can maintain both freedom and equality. For, as he summed up the proper relation between the state and its citizens, "It exists through and for them, just as they exist through and for it."

No educational system can be better than the society of which it is part, a truth that has been obscured by the fact that our educational leadership has traditionally been provided by privately endowed institutions, which can easily become instruments of special privilege. But such a recognition as John Dewey's of the functional relationship between a society and its schools and colleges does not solve our problems. It merely poses the enormous difficulties with which we are to be faced in the postwar period. For in a decaying and confused era of capitalism such as this country will still be living in, it is not easy to furnish even pieces of a democratic education. One of our surest guides, however, is that generally today we can trust those who talk about equality as Henry Wallace does, instead of those who talk about the freedom of free enterprise in a free society. As far as the role of government in education is concerned, we may conceivably have established a precedent in the way that the army and navy are now sending some of their most intelligent men to the universities for special training. Such a fact might strengthen the hands of those who insist that in a democracy higher education must be effectively open to all who show aptitude for it, and that the government could well set up all sorts of competitive peacetime scholarships.

But in our educational record between wars, the paradox remains that although the majority of our college students attended the large state universities, our most rewarding educational experiments were often made in small colleges, such as Swarthmore or Saint John's. What that seems to indicate is that if an institution is to emphasize the values of a community and not merely those of rugged and/or standardized individualism, it must itself be a community. Such a condition is difficult to establish in our mass-producing universities unless they provide something like the experimental college at Wisconsin or the tutorial system at Harvard. An educational community depends on the intimate interplay of minds between teachers and students, in ways we have just begun to explore. The larger universities have handicapped themselves by stressing conventional scholarly production to such a degree that, if my experience with two of them is at all typical, an overwhelming proportion of their ablest younger teachers during the past fifteen years have ended by going elsewhere. Yet it is only to educational communities that we can look, not for the theory but for the real practice of education.

One further prevailing error that I would like to see corrected is the repetition, by editorial writers as well as by university functionaries, that the recent generation of students were empty cynics who "believed in nothing." Such may have been true toward the end of the nineteen twenties, when I recall a Yale Lit editor who put himself through college by playing the stock market. But from the beginning of the New Deal, college students all over the country commenced to develop a new and healthy social consciousness, quite unlike, in its mass basis, anything we had had before. The fact that most of these students were opposed to war in 1939 and 1940 should not cause anyone to overlook that in many cases they were thinking more deeply than their elders. They were not isolationists; they had backed collective security, but they were opposed to going to war until they could feel that the issues were clear. It is that generation, the generation now between twenty and thirty, who can be most trusted to insist that after the war we must develop democratic cultural values as well as the society to support them. F. O. MATTHIESSEN

Interim Report

Lend-Lease: Weapon for Victory, by Edward R. Stettinius Jr. New York: The Macmillan Company. 358 pages. $3.

IN JANUARY, 1941, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh testified before breathless committees of the House and Senate against the then proposed lend-lease bill—H. R. 1776. I remember the crowded gatherings, the motion-picture cameras, the fashionable women and the crush in the biggest conference rooms of Congress. The United States was not at war. Britain was pressed to the wall. France had fallen. Russia was not yet in the fray and the Communists were denouncing the "imperialistic" struggle. Mr. Roosevelt had put through the destroyers-for-bases deal, and American industry had started to build airplanes, tanks and military supplies for the Allies. Then came President Roosevelt's December 17, 1940, press conference where he likened America's policy to lending "a garden hose" to put out "a neighbor's fire."

It is interesting to recall now, in "Lend-Lease: Weapon for Victory," the diverse elements which opposed the bill. There were Gerald L. K. Smith and Colonel Lindbergh; Norman Thomas and Alf Landon; General Wood's America First Committee and left-wing groups like the American Student Union. Sincere and respectable Robert M. Hutchins and Herbert Hoover fought it. Thomas E. Dewey first opposed, then supported, it. Senate Republicans voted against the measure 2-to-1, House Republicans 5-to-1, despite which it passed, and today is the economic bloodstream of the Allied war effort. It is one of the few developments whose success is almost universally acknowledged, in token of which its renewal brought only six dissenting votes.

The present book is an interim report on lend-lease to the nation, such as handsome, youthful, silver-haired Mr. Stettinius might have made to his U. S. Steel Corporation stockholders when he was chairman of the board, age 37. The book is factual and carefully non-controversial. It is not due to the humdrum style nor to the infrequent personal revelations that its cumulative effect is inspiring. This effect is achieved by the encyclopedic world picture it paints, and the record it gives of improved strategic, military and human relationships resulting from the free exchange of goods among the Allies, with the dollar sign left off.

The book brings the matter down only to June 30 of this year, when United States lend-lease expenditures were $12,900,000,000. But events move swiftly. Mr. Stettinius himself is no longer active head of the agency but is now Undersecretary of State, and even as I write the latest lend-lease report shows that, as of November 30, the accelerated release of goods has jumped the total American share to $18,600,000,000—one-third more in the five months since the book was finished.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The author tells how Winston Churchill delicately took snuff out of "a little antique silver box" at 10 Downing Street after Stettinius presented him with an air-borne Virginia ham in 1942. It tells of the tremendous decision of the late Arthur Purvis, British Purchasing Commissioner in New York when France fell, on June 15, 1940, to take over $500,000,000 worth of French contracts and supply assets on his own responsibility, and of how the papers were rushed through at three in the morning in an apartment overlooking New York City, a few hours before the Treasury froze the whole situation.

But these dramatic personal incidents are rare. This book is a chronicle, for Congress and the nation, answering questions, settling doubts and telling the plain, factual and tremendous story of what lend-lease aid, and reverse lend-lease, mean. Perhaps the most important hint is to the future: "The way to economic collaboration in the postwar world lies along the path charted in Article VII of the Master Lend-Lease Agreements," Mr. Stettinius thinks. This provides for a postwar agreement, open to "all countries of like mind," directed to the expansion "of production, employment and the exchange and consumption of goods." This little known article, already signed, may be a symbol for the future.

RICHARD LEE STROUT

What Made Sammy

Seventy Years of Life and Labor: An Autobiography, by Samuel Gompers. New One-Volume Edition with an Introduction by Matthew Woll. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1,186 pages. $5.

NO AMERICAN LABOR LEADER has entered the Pantheon of national heroes. Matthew Josephson wrote two readable and valuable collective biographies of figures of the last century, "The Robber Barons" and "The Politicos." A third volume on the labor leaders of the period might have been expected if one forgot what an unexciting lot they were on the whole. For the curious there is Mike Walsh (*fl.* 1835-59) whose "Spartan Band" worked for labor reform and the greater glory of its Tammany ward-heeler leader. For the serious: William Sylvis, who, if he had not died young, might have become the first nationally important leader; Terence V. Powderly, mayor of Scranton, grand master workman of the Knights of Labor and Republican functionary after the decline of the Noble Order; Martin Irons, who was sufficiently bold an organizer to frighten Jay Gould. The rest are buried in the largely unreadable histories of American labor, except for John Mitchell, who is still venerated in the mining towns; Debs, whose mantle is fought over by every variety of American radical; and Debs's arch foe, Samuel Gompers.

Within the space of a few days last fall the American Federation of Labor opposed repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, refused to interfere with the unequal treatment of Negroes and the existence of racketeering in certain of its affiliated unions, hymned free enterprise and damned socialism, and declined collaboration with Soviet trade unions.

Each of these acts can well be considered the fruits of several of Sampel Gompers' most cherished objectives: "maintenance of the nation depended upon the maintenance of racial purity and strength" (this from a London-

BORZOI BOOKS

THEY SHALL NOT SLEEP

by LELAND STOWE. Not only great war reporting, but a passionate and moving discussion of the peace that may or may not come—based upon what Stowe saw and learned in Burma, India, China, and Russia, and written, at last, without fear of foreign censorship. By the author of *No Other Road to Freedom.* $3.00

A PREFACE TO PEACE

by HAROLD CALLENDER. A critical analysis of American foreign policy, as it was shaped, unshaped and misshaped in the prewar years, and as it is now being revised to meet our changing needs and the requirements of a durable peace. By a member of the *New York Times* Washington staff. $3.00

WORK AND PLAY

by JULES ROMAINS. The eleventh volume in the vast *Men of Good Will.* Europe in the mid-1920's. ... Outwardly quiet, inwardly the continent begins to seethe again. Meanwhile, elections, murders, speculation in stocks, divorces: the stuff of life between two wars. $3.00

THE RUSSIAN ARMY

by WALTER KERR. The former Moscow correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune* presents the facts-and-figures story of the fabulous Red Army: its personnel, organization, training and equipment. 8 battlefront maps illustrate brilliant analytical descriptions of the battles for Moscow and for Stalingrad. $3.00

TCHAIKOVSKY

by HERBERT WEINSTOCK. "The honest and amazingly detailed record of a life as psychologically interesting and revealing as a Havelock Ellis case history. It is also a musical and political panorama of great scope ... will remain *the* book in English." —*Atlantic Monthly.* Illus. $5.00

ALFRED · A · KNOPF

Invest in Victory with War Bonds

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

born Dutch Jew), autonomy of the unions within the Federation, integration of organized labor within a capitalist national economy, pitiless scorn for socialism and a burning hatred of communism. These aims illuminate Gompers' role during the forty-odd years he dominated the American labor movement, in which it was "Americanized," skilled and semi-skilled workers were organized into a loose federation of autonomous unions with the vast body of workers left unorganized, and the AFL and such "enlightened" employers as Mark Hanna entered into the uneasy alliance of the National Civic Federation. Throughout these years Gompers fought off successively the collective blandishments of the Knights, the Socialist Party, the IWW and the Communists with the same vigor, skill and rude wit with which he battled to improve the status of the worker. As the capstone of his career he mobilized American labor in support of the First World War, toured Europe to combat the anti-war spirit that infected sections of the British, French and Italian working classes and pointed a warning finger at Russian Bolshevism.

The prolix autobiography that Gompers finished shortly before his death in 1924 is an ample, if informal and naturally prejudiced, personal and social history. Enormously uneven, it is at once aggressively dull and unconsciously revealing, forthright and evasive, shrewd and fatuous, generous and petty. Apart from its formal shortcomings as a piece of writing, it lacks the shaping understanding that justifies Lincoln Steffens' equally prolix account of the period (each deals with a surprisingly large number of the same events and personalities).

In calling "Seventy Years of Life and Labor" "a spiritual history of the American nation from the Civil War to the Great War," John R. Commons described perhaps what he as a historian was able to carry away from the book; it is hardly explicit in Gompers' text. One possible gloss is suggested above. Another is the burden of Dos Passos' "U. S. A.": the death of the heart in modern America. (John R. Dos Passos, the elder, "one of New York's greatest lawyers and financiers whose tendencies were liberal and democratic," once offered Gompers the presidency of an industrial accident-insurance company, saying that "in ten years [Gompers] would be the possessor of a million dollars. . . . He felt very much chagrined when, after the interview, I flatly refused his offer.") The most common interpretation is an Algerian "From Rags to Riches," which is given renewed topicality by Gompers' pleasant recollection of a certain "affable, serious" little king whom he visited at the Italian front in 1918. ("Later, he sent me a book of photographs taken by official photographers showing the wonderful engineering and military feats of the Italian army. It is a book I prize highly.")

George Soule has written of Gompers' gifts: "His power, his jealousy of the unions and their prestige, the hot partisanship of his opinions—these account for his extraordinary achievement as a leader of men." American radicals, even when recognizing Gompers' undoubted abilities as spokesman, organizer and advocate, have tended to look bitterly at them. But an American Yeats might have seen it thus:

> Had Gompers eaten Debs's heart, the land's
> Imagination had been satisfied.

GEORGE MAYBERRY

"One of the most important books published in many decades." —*Boston Herald.*

NEW ZEALAND

A WORKING DEMOCRACY

By Walter Nash

Deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand

"NEW ZEALAND has earned the right to a voice in the conduct of the war and the negotiation of the peace. Moreover, as Mr. Nash points out, small nations . . . may often have something to say that is worth listening to, worth paying attention to, even, perhaps worth acting on. . . . New Zealand is fortunate in her spokesman."
—*New Republic.*

With an Introduction by Eric Estorick. $3.50

DUELL, SLOAN AND PEARCE

DUELL, SLOAN & PEARCE, Inc.
270 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of NEW ZEALAND at $3.50 a copy.

☐ Enclosed ☐ Send C. O. D.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....

NR 122

Portrait of a Musician

Tchaikovsky, by Herbert Weinstock. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 416 pages. $5.

THE DAMP ELEMENTS of a gloomy self-expression have an urgent way of occupying the foreground when we listen to most of Tchaikovsky's music. If, however, they are responsible for his enormous popularity, they are not necessarily the chief repository of his greatness. For his passages of most obvious self-pity are often the most deplorable interruptions of the elegant and brilliant flow of his inspiration—as if someone, well on the way to a bold achievement, were suddenly to collapse in tears to bemoan an impotence to continue toward a set goal. This is something of what I feel, for example, in the first movement of the "Pathetic," when the stunning episodes from the opening of the allegro to the second theme finally break down into a static lament when this theme is reached. Or the same type of interference may be observed in any of the symphonies considered with respect to the unity of all the movements.

Some listeners have been driven by these lapses to a complete intolerance of anything Tchaikovsky ever wrote. How can a man who believed in such artless effusions, they are likely to object, be capable of anything more exalted? Herbert Weinstock's sober and remarkably faithful biography, perhaps without consciously attempting to do so,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provides the answer merely by an excellent presentation of the facts of the composer's career and without withholding or exaggerating anything for glamor or sensational effect. The truth is that Tchaikovsky did not believe in the value of much that he wrote and neither does Mr. Weinstock. The portrait is of an artist constantly dissatisfied and insecure in his work, and repeatedly fearful that he has "written himself out"—of an artist who seems, in the act of composition, to have been carried away by a troubled soul and the storminess of his times, but who adhered basically to a classical idealism and worshiped Mozart above all others. In the cool aftermath of creative activity, speaking from his sense of musical purity, he could frankly observe an "excess of color and insincerity, something labored," in his Fifth Symphony, and, confirming our most wishful thinking, he could dismiss the "1812" overture as "a very loud and noisy" piece written "with little warmth or love," or the "Nutcracker" as "definitely inferior to 'Sleeping Beauty.'"

Every opera he composed made it more obvious that he would be more fruitfully engaged developing his symphonic talents, but something compelled him to squander ever further efforts on a form which his beloved Mozart had preferred above all others and which Tchaikovsky, paradoxically from our vantage point, pursued the more vigorously because it was, in his day, a way of his getting "in touch with the masses." As Weinstock infers, the preoccupation with opera, for which he was quite unsuited, may indeed have been the most decisive factor in his failure to find the time to eliminate from his symphonic style the aberrations which now disturb us. Perhaps because he did not share with other musical masters the conviction of his genius, often considering himself no more than a "gifted" musician, he did not organize his life with respect to the loftiest aims. He swayed in the wind. A weakness of character made him succumb very foolishly to the first woman insistent enough on the subject of marriage; and the same weakness exposed him to the uncritical admission of the measures of naïve and unobjectified feeling into music which was capable of achieving, in other measures, a most sensitive lyricism, a counterpoint expressed through the finest orchestral clarity, and an embodiment of the noblest and most delicate gestures of classical ballet.

Weinstock's book is mainly a chronological study, dealing only incidentally with the music in quotations from newly available diaries and letters and through occasional keen asides by the author. An eye for relevance makes it much more absorbing and communicative than most undertakings of its kind. It will be disappointing to those who seek passionate details to fill out the brooding pulsations which are the elements they value most in the music. Piotr Ilyich does not plot the murder of his wife, nor does he commit suicide; Mme. von Meck remains the idealistic widow perplexing to our callous age; and all the impressive fresh sources consulted for what must certainly be regarded as the definitive biography in English, fail to disclose the spicy intimacies to elaborate the picture of a homosexuality which must remain implicit in certain terms of endearment, undenied rumors, payments which seem to Weinstock to have been purchases of silence and the composer's revealing references to a "vice," "natural inclinations" and a *mariage de convenance.*

ARTHUR BERGER

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY · HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

. . . . A new kind of autobiography — . . . by a Japanese anti-fascist — . . . who is an important American artist.

THE
New Sun

by TARO YASHIMA

• One of the most distinguished and moving books we have been privileged to issue during this war is the autobiography, in words and pictures, of a young Japanese liberal. Taro Yashima suffered jail and torture in his homeland because he championed, with his brush and his pen, the cause of the people against the militarists. He and his wife escaped to America, where he wrote and illustrated the story of his life — a book extraordinary not only for its beauty and simplicity but because it brings to America the first real news of the liberal underground movement in Japan.

"Surprising proof that a Japanese underground movement does exist."—*N. Y. Post*

"Taro Yashima is a fighter for democracy worthy to rank with his Japanese-American cousins battling the Nazis with the Fifth Army."—*St. Louis Post*

"It is a new kind of book, with something new to tell —something tremendously encouraging, something to renew hope and faith."—*Oakland Post Inquirer*

"An original and powerful work."—*Boston Herald*

"A simple and moving document . . . The black-and-whites tell the story with eloquence."—*N. Y. Times*

• The publishers have issued, for Japanese-Americans, a booklet of the text of THE NEW SUN, in Japanese, keyed to the drawings on each page. It will be supplied free of charge to anyone who requests it with his order for THE NEW SUN.

$2.75 AT YOUR BOOKSTORE

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
257 FOURTH AVENUE • NEW YORK 10

NOW ON EXHIBIT . . . DRAWINGS
by Taro Yashima in a one-man show at the A.C.A. gallery, 63 E. 57th St., N. Y., through January 29th.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY · HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Reader's List

A SHORT HISTORY OF RUSSIA, by B. H. Sumner (Reynal and Hitchcock, $3.75). This is the only reasonably satisfactory one-volume history of Russia from the earliest to the latest times at present available. Mr. Sumner's presentation is novel, in that he does not give a consecutive all-over account, but lays out his material under seven headings. These basic conceptions, as he calls them, are, The Frontier, The State, The Land, The Church, The Slavs, The Sea and The West. It cannot be said that he is uniformly successful in treating of these conceptions or that his style is lively. His account of the state, in so far as it refers to the Soviet system, is unsatisfactory. The lack of a serious, isolated treatment of Soviet political philosophy is a grave one. The author is respectful of Soviet achievements and objective enough in his approach to them.

EMPIRE, by Louis Fischer (Duell, Sloan and Pearce, $1). Peace, according to Fischer, is possible only if the causes of war are eliminated. British imperialism threatens world peace as much as fascist aggression. For in India the anti-British attitude is universal and threatens a new conflagration unless the promise of democracy is extended to her. The problem of abolishing India's colonial status is "no more complicated than the political reconstruction and economic rehabilitation of postwar Europe." Mr. Fischer refutes all the arguments in favor of British rule in India, the alleged Hindu-Moslem rift, the problem of illiteracy as it affects self-government, etc. India, writes Fischer, "is as ripe for freedom as Russia was for revolution, as the United States of 1932 was for the New Deal. . . . The question in India is not whether the Indians are ripe for independence; the question is whether the British are ripe for Indian independence." Searching for the causes of British reluctance to grant India her freedom, Fischer finds that "the British nation has succumbed to the illusion that the loss of some Englishmen's economic and social advantages are synonymous with the nation's loss."

PUBLIC THINKING ON POSTWAR PROBLEMS, by Jerome S. Bruner (National Planning Association, Pamphlet No. 23, 25 cents). This pamphlet offers some interesting and significant results of a Gallup poll on the public's attitude toward postwar problems. It shows by means of charts and graphs that the American people are more favorably disposed toward planning than we have been led to believe. Almost 60 percent are certain that we can abolish unemployment and more than 85 percent feel that some form of coördinated planning is an important requisite for future economic well being. Attitudes toward such questions as postwar conversion, demobilization and aid to returning servicemen are also analyzed. The general impression is that Americans are far in advance of their elected representatives.

THE AMERICAN STORY OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS (Williams Press, $1.50). This volume is an interesting experiment in the field of educational texts. Sponsored by the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Industrial and Labor Conditions, and designed primarily for high schools, it traces in a straightforward and simple manner the growth of American labor policy from early nineteenth-century practices to the present. While reviewing the pattern of political and economic ideas that accompanied industrial change, subtle emphasis is placed on the need for faith in "free enterprise." This, of course, follows the accepted educational policy of "no indoctrination." The volume has the weaknesses characteristic of any work that squats safely in the middle of controversial issues. The many well constructed illustrative charts are the best part of the book.

ARROW POINTING NOWHERE, by Elizabeth Daly (Farrar and Rinehart, $2). Henry Gamadge finally gets one of the crumpled notes that someone has been tossing out of the Fenway house next door, and is off on the most exciting adventure of his career. Miss Daly's best book so far, and a smooth and intelligent job. Highly recommended.

Contributors

JULIAN HUXLEY, well known biologist, writer and member of the famous BBC "Brains Trust," is closely associated with PEP, the British planning organization. He is the author, among other books, of "Democracy Marches," "The Uniqueness of Man" and "Evolution: The Modern Synthesis," published last year by Harpers.

PRUDENCIO DE PEREDA has been published in Story magazine, Twice a Year, Life and Letters Today and other literary journals. Some of his work was included in the O'Brien and O. Henry Memorial short-story collections. He is with the American Specialized Training Program of the army.

F. O. MATTHIESSEN, a graduate of Yale, is professor of History and Literature at Harvard University and the author, among other books, of "American Renaissance." He is now completing a new book, "Henry James: The Major Phase."

RICHARD LEE STROUT is a Washington correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor.

ARTHUR BERGER is a member of the music staff of The New York Sun and has appeared in Partisan Review, Modern Music, The New York Herald Tribune and other publications.

How to get your tax refund!

Soldier's Tax Guide

for SOLDIERS, SAILORS, WACS, WAVES and OFFICERS too

By TAXPERT, War Department attorney and "tax columnist" of the Washington Times-Herald. Any time after January 1, 1944, an estimated 3,000,000 servicemen may collect an estimated $100,000,000 in income tax refunds. If you're entitled to a refund—in most cases all you paid on your 1942 tax—this guide tells you in simple language how to file a claim with your collector of internal revenue. Full instructions for men not entitled to refunds but allowed to "recompute" 1942 tax "excluding earned income"! Four sample 1943 returns—with 4-page "long form." Detailed advice on service tax matters not available in Treasury instructions. For your copy, 32 9x12-in. pages, send 50¢ to Barrister Publications, 4520 MacArthur, Washington 7, D. C.—60¢ outside Continental U. S.

LITERARY SERVICE

TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES, Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable result. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

LANGUAGES

PHONOGRAPH RECORD COURSES. All Makes. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., New York City 17, N. Y.

Order your books — all books — mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 E. 49th St., New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED